UNITED STATES DE SOUTHERN DISTRIC		
 UNITED STATES OF	x F AMERICA,	
V.		17 CR 684 (ER)
CHRISTIAN DAWKII CODE ,	NS and MERL	
I	Defendants.	Trial
	x	New York, N.Y.
		April 29, 2019 9:00 a.m.
		J. 00 a.m.
Before:		
	HON. EDGA	RDO RAMOS
		District Judge
	A DDEAT	ANGEG
	APPEAF	ANCES
	tes Attorney for	
ROBERT L. BOONE	istrict of New Yo	rk
NOAH D. SOLOWIE. ELI J. MARK		
	Jnited States Att	orneys
HANEY LAW GROUP Attorney fo	PLLC or Defendant Dawl	ins
CHANEY LEGAL SEI		
	and-	
NEXSEN PRUET, LI BY: ANDREW A. 1	MATHIAS	
MARK C. MOO Attorneys	DRE for Defendant Cod	e
		pecial Agent FBI
•	YOLANDA BUSTILLO, EMILY GOLDMAN, Pa	Paralegal Specialist USA

1 (Trial resumed; jury not present)

THE COURT: OK. Folks, it's 9 o'clock. Are we waiting for Mr. Solowiejczyk?

MR. BOONE: We can begin, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. This morning I awoke to a bounty.

There were any number of emails from the parties. Let me ask, which of these have to be decided this morning?

MR. CHANEY: Your Honor, I think the government's request regarding statements made by -- some statements by Mr. Dawkins, some by Mr. Code that would be introduced through Mr. Sood I think would be appropriate for us to handle today.

MR. MOORE: I don't agree.

MR. CHANEY: I mean with respect to the calls that the government intends to introduce.

MR. HANEY: I would defer to the government. I don't know what they're going to put on and what order they're going to put it on. I have one issue, as the Court's aware, that one particular call.

MR. MOORE: I would say, for Mr. Code, I don't believe that Mr. Solowiejczyk's letter motion needs to be decided this morning. As I noted in my perhaps inadvertent email to the Court and then with a follow-up email, I believe that that issue should be resolved after Mr. Sood testifies. With respect to Ms. Tutwiler, her testimony, and the testimony of Mr. Mowery, we are not going to get to that until perhaps

Wednesday, I would think, at the earliest. I don't know that that needs to be decided either.

THE COURT: Mr. Solowiejczyk?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, I apologize for being tardy this morning.

Your Honor, we would respectfully request a ruling from the Court before direct examination of Mr. Sood is concluded because, if the Court actually does intend to allow this stuff in, we'd like to ask Mr. Sood about it on direct, understandably. I anticipate Mr. Sood's direct will probably take, it's hard to be precise, but probably the entire day or close to it. So we could go through most of it and then see where we are, but the government does feel strongly that a ruling is appropriate before his direct examination is concluded.

THE COURT: Just so we're clear, we're talking about the two transcripts that you attached to your letter, right? I read the transcripts, but orient me. I don't know what's going on with respect to those conversations.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: So there's two different issues.

The recording that Mr. Code seeks to admit is a conversation, I think -- I don't have the exact date in front of me -- early August between Merl Code and Munish Sood. And they want to, really, admit one portion of that conversation, and that portion is Merl Code recounting for Mr. Sood a prior

conversation that he purportedly had with Christian Dawkins in which he said, in relevant part, that he basically told Christian, Jeff, and those guys want to meet all these coaches: OK. Great. Well, we can pay them. No, no, you're not paying my guys.

The problem with that, your Honor, is that this is not a forward-looking statement. Accordingly, it doesn't fall under the state of mind exception. It's merely Mr. Code recounting a supposed prior conversation that he had with Christian Dawkins. And the defendants' ability to offer this statement, as we briefed in the motions in limine, the state of mind exception is a relatively narrow exception, and this does not fall within it. So, respectfully, we do not think the defense should be permitted to admit this portion of the recording.

Then with respect to what Mr. Haney is trying to get in for Dawkins, we're admitting most of that recording already. There's a small portion at the end that Dawkins would like to admit, and that relates to the discussion between Sood and Dawkins there about a meeting that's yet to come that day with a sports agent Raymond Brothers. And the pertinent quotes are Mr. Dawkins saying -- I want to find the exact quote here. "He can stay in the room and F'ing get stroked off some more."

THE COURT: I'm sorry. What page?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Of the transcript, I'm at page 6.

This is Exhibit B. Line 9: "He can stay in this room and F'ing get stroked off some more," and then Sood's response of "Let's stroke him off a little more." Your Honor, this pertains to a meeting with the sports agent Raymond Brothers. It has nothing to do with the coaches. Really, it's just — on top of that, I mean, these comments really don't add any value.

To the extent, I read Mr. Haney's response briefly, but he wants to get in the statements from Mr. Sood, "let's stroke him off a little more," the coconspirator exception does not apply when the defense seeks to offer statements. It only applies when the government does. We're happy to send your Honor a couple of cases on that. So we just don't think this is relevant, and we also think it's hearsay.

THE COURT: When are these coming in relative to Mr. Sood's testimony, if you know?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: This call will come in probably by the middle of the day, the second one. And the first call that I referenced we're not seeking to admit at all, so we would only admit it if your Honor says that the defense would be able to.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. CHANEY: Your Honor, could I just factually put
Mr. Code's statements into context? I think the context is
really important. As it pertains to Mr. Solowiejczyk's
argument that it's rear-looking, it's sort of a recounting of a

prior conversation between Mr. Code and Mr. Dawkins.

Mr. Code is speaking to Mr. Sood about another gentleman, Seth, for really the entirety of that phone call.

And what he's saying is that this gentleman, Seth, doesn't know what he's doing. He just wants to throw money at problems.

That's not the way you build relationships. That's not the way you get loyalty. That's not the way you get things done.

THE COURT: Can you tell me who Seth is? I don't need a last name, but what does Seth do?

MR. CHANEY: So Seth is another gentleman sort of in this agency, financial space. What we know now that Mr. Code didn't know in that phone call is Mr. Sood actually owned Mr. Cohen's company. Mr. Code did not know that at the time, but it's a business associate of Mr. Sood's that's a mutual acquaintance of Mr. Code.

So Mr. Code and Mr. Sood are discussing Seth Cohen for the large majority of this call. Mr. Code is saying that this Seth Cohen gentleman doesn't understand how the business works. And to illustrate a point that he's trying to make with Mr. Sood with respect to Mr. Cohen, he says: "It's like the conversation I had with Christian Dawkins where I said, 'Don't pay my guys.' Jeff wants to pay my guys. I said, 'Don't pay my guys.'"

So to the degree that that quote actually evinces for the jury a present and then existing state of mind that

Mr. Code then, as we argue throughout the entirety of this case, he then was not of the opinion that paying coaches was an appropriate business model, that he didn't have a specific intent to do so, that he hadn't joined an agreement to do so. So while the conversation with Mr. Dawkins certainly is from a point in time previous to the comment, it still is direct evidence of his then-existing state of mind insofar as he's relying on to explain his state of mind at that time during the phone call.

MR. MOORE: Your Honor, I'm going to pick up here on the law for just a moment, if I may. The statement from Mr. Code is, "I'm telling you, you're not paying my guys." The government has introduced a transcript of a meeting in June of 2017, and they've used — introduced certain portions of that transcript and had Mr. Blazer, who had met Mr. Code that very day, comment about Mr. Blazer's interpretations as to what Mr. Code meant at various points with respect to that conversation.

One of the points that I'm sure we're going to hear in closing argument from the government is Mr. Code makes a statement, which was discussed by Mr. Blazer and commented on by Mr. Blazer, that you don't have — that you don't pay everyone now or you might not want to pay them now, but you pay them later. Part of our defense is going to be that Mr. Code is listening to people that he's just met. He's pitching them

on a business opportunity. He is not going to completely disagree with what they are saying, and he's not going to tell them, for example, that day, in front of everyone in that room, that their idea of paying coaches is stupid and no one does that, frankly, if you're trying to get business from someone.

But I'm sure that the government is going to take the position that Mr. Code had the intent that day and his intent continued to pay coaches. Mr. Code is saying to Mr. Sood, one of his alleged coconspirators, "you're not paying my guys."

That can be interpreted that you're not paying them now and you're not paying them in the future, and that is not a statement from someone who has knowingly, willfully, and unlawfully joined a conspiracy with knowledge of its purpose. It is a forward-looking statement. It is not a backwards-looking statements. So it is admissible, we contend, under the state of mind exception.

It's also arguably admissible, depending on what Mr. Sood says on direct, as impeachment of Mr. Sood. It is admissible, I believe, to show a statement by a party to an alleged conspiracy to a conspirator that I am not down with, I am not agreeing with your proposed plans to pay these coaches.

Finally, I believe it's admissible as under the catchall exception of the hearsay rule because it has circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness. I put Mr. Solowiejczyk on notice yesterday, or last evening after I

got his letter motion, that I intended to rely on the catchall exception to the hearsay rule. And I recall that we crossed this river a little bit, but not nearly to this extent, in Gatto. And I have read DeMaria and some of the other cases that were mentioned in Mr. Solowiejczyk's memorandum, but I reread them last night about 1 o'clock in the morning. One of the things that I note about DeMaria and the other cases that are cited in Mr. Solowiejczyk's memorandum is that the admission of most of the statements at issue there had to deal with postarrest statements made by a defendant, self-serving postarrest statements. This is not a self-serving, postarrest statement. This is a conversation that is recorded by the government at the time it is made, and it bears circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness.

These conversations that Mr. Solowiejczyk says — these purported conversations between Mr. Code and Mr. Dawkins, they aren't purported conversations. They were intercepted by the government. The government may not want to introduce most of them, but we will seek to introduce them in the defense case. And we would respectfully request that we have the opportunity to play these calls during Mr. Sood's cross-examination. If your Honor decides not to allow us to play those calls, then we may seek to offer them in the defense case in chief.

But with respect to the circumstantial guarantees of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

trustworthiness, if you look at the rule, Judge, and one of the things I would note DeMaria talks about the, I quess, exceptions to the hearsay rules in 803, and it also talks about the catchall exception. At the time DeMaria was decided, and I am old enough to remember when the catchall exception was not in Rule 807, but it was codified in Rule 803(24) and 804(b)(5), declarant available, declarant nonavailable, it talks about -the Court in DeMaria talks about the catchall exception of the hearsay rules and talks about, to an extent, the reasons behind the catchall exception of the hearsay rule. And I understand that we do have to show that it has circumstantial quarantees of trustworthiness. When you put that statement in context with the other statements that we seek to offer and you note that it is recorded by the government during the time period of this alleged conspiracy -- and I would note, this is almost two months before the government took down this case. This is almost two months before the government contends that this alleged conspiracy ended, this alleged conspiracy to pay coaches, and you have an alleged coconspirator telling his supposed coconspirator, "you're not paying my guys," meaning you and Jeff D'Angelo and whoever else is a party to your little agreement to pay coaches, that you are not paying my guys.

When you look at the codified exceptions to the hearsay rule, the codified exceptions of the hearsay rule have

sort of built in circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness. So, for example, they allow present sense impression, excited utterance, then-existing mental or emotional or physical condition, records of regularly collected activity, recorded recollection. All of those categories, the exceptions to the hearsay rule, have circumstantial guarantees of trustworthiness because they relate to things that a declarant sees or does at the time he sees or does it. Here, this relates to something that the declarant sees and says at the time and during the time period of the conspiracy.

So I believe that all the cases cited by

Mr. Solowiejczyk are distinguishable, and I have not found a

single case that deals with wiretapped conversations

intercepted by the government which the government then seeks

to exclude.

THE COURT: Are you agreeing, Mr. Moore, that the statement that you're seeking to include does not, strictly speaking, come within 803(3).

MR. MOORE: No, sir, your Honor, I am not. I do not agree with that. I'm making an alternate argument in case the Court chooses not to accept my present sense impression or state of mind argument. That is an alternate theory of admissibility. As I said, I think there are other alternate theories of admissibility. To impeach Mr. Sood, depending on what he says, and we don't know what he's going to say yet. So

that's why I don't think a ruling at this time is appropriate.

I also believe, and I must say, that the government knows this evidence exists. The government knows that this evidence is exculpatory. The government seeks to exclude it, but the government asks your Honor to rule either for them or against them now, because if you rule against them now, they seek to front it. I think that's a little unseemly.

THE COURT: Mr. Solowiejczyk.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, a couple of points in response to that. Number one, if there truly exists calls between Merl Code and Christian Dawkins or Merl Code and Jeff D'Angelo, actually, we're going to play one on direct, where he's making a forward-looking statement about what's to come in Las Vegas, we're not saying those may not fall under the state of mind exception. In fact, we agreed to play one of those with the defense over the weekend. It's going to come in under direct.

What's happening here are the following:

Conversations that are actually forward-looking to that effect, they don't really exist. So what they're trying to do is take a statement by Mr. Code after the fact to Mr. Sood in which he claims to have told Christian Dawkins, don't pay any coaches — it's actually a lot more complicated than that — but if they want to admit these statements that are actually forward-looking that Mr. Code made to Mr. D'Angelo or

Mr. Dawkins saying, hey, when you guys go to Vegas, don't pay coaches, that's a horse of a different color, but that's not what we have here.

Your Honor, I think, respectfully, it requires a close reading of the transcripts. I'm not expecting your Honor to rule right this second. All we're saying is if the Court actually is going to say this is admissible, the government should have an opportunity to know that before it concludes its direct examination of Mr. Sood. There's nothing unseemly about that.

As to the residual exception, we don't think that this call would fall in under that, but we can -- we just received Mr. Moore's letter on that last night, even though the rule says that you're supposed to give notice before trial.

THE COURT: Or hearing.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Or hearing. So, frankly, we don't think it falls under that exception, but to fully respond to that, we're going to need a little more time. But the reality is it definitely does not fall under the state of mind exception.

MR. MOORE: I would note that I gave the government notice of the residual exception argument after -- shortly after I received their letter motion seeking to exclude this. We went back and forth with the government last week and over the weekend, as we've been going back and forth with the

government for several weeks about what statements they would agree to admit and what statements they would not. I don't believe that there's any lateness to my notice and intent to rely on the residual exception. I would note there are cases in various circuits on the flexibility of the notice requirement depending on the facts in the particular case. I litigated one in the Fourth Circuit years ago when I was a prosecutor, and I can provide that citation to your Honor if your Honor would like.

I agree that perhaps your Honor needs to read the transcript carefully. I would simply note that the statements by Mr. Code to Mr. Sood about what he has told Mr. Dawkins and what he has told Mr. D'Angelo, that is to put the statement in context that you're not paying my guys. The statement "you're not paying my guys" is a statement of Mr. Code's intention that day and a statement of Mr. Code's intention going forward with respect to his intention to join and be a part of this conspiracy.

MR. HANEY: Your Honor, may I? I understand, at least from what Mr. Solowiejczyk said, my issue may be a little bit more of an immediate issue. I know I don't have the floor for very long, but I would like to impress upon the Court the context of the call that he's referencing that may be played imminently is not being represented accurately. The context of the call originates out of Book Richardson at a meeting with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Munish Sood and Jeff D'Angelo where Jeff D'Angelo pays Book Richardson, the coach, \$5,000. During the course of that phone conversation, Munish Sood and Christian Dawkins are laughing about why Jeff D'Angelo would have made that payment.

A later point of that phone call, Munish Sood suggests they get Jeff D'Angelo back to the hotel so they can stroke him off a little more, which is a forward-thinking act, obviously, but they're in the context, still, of laughing about what had happened earlier in the day. And what the government seeks to do is play a portion of a wiretapped recording and not the complete portion of that recording, which they should under the rule of completeness play the whole recording so the jury can have the context of really what is going on with these two gentlemen, which is they're both laughing at why Jeff D'Angelo is paying coaches. And Munish Sood, he's articulating to Christian Dawkins, as Dawkins is to Sood, how it doesn't make sense to pay coaches, and Sood suggests to get him back to the hotel for a later meeting that afternoon to stroke him off a little more, "more" being the operative word, which means they've been stroking him off the whole time.

Your Honor, I don't see how they could suggest that under the rule of completeness, under the effect on the listener that that call should not be played in its entirety. And it's a very short phone call. It's a call that only lasts maybe three minutes. So I would submit that the whole call

should be played to the jury. Let the jury be the one to determine what the context of that conversation is, what did Munish Sood mean by "let's get him back and stroke him off a little more."

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Solowiejczyk.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, briefly, to be clear, we had extensive negotiations with the defense about this call, and we're playing page 1, line 1, through page 4, line 24, which actually makes all the points that Mr. Haney just said. It's very — that's because when we gave this call a close look, we're reasonable people, and we said, you know what? This one actually does fall under the state of mind exception and is admissible.

But the way the rule of completeness works is not that, well, since we're putting part of the call in, let's put all of the call in. That's not how it works. There's nothing about what follows that puts anything in context from what came before. The part of the conversation that we've excluded relates to a player named Kyle Kuzma that Mr. Sood represents. It relates to an upcoming meeting with Raymond Brothers. And the points that Mr. Haney just made, they're all covered in the first part of the call. So there really is very limited relevance, other than trying to get in a rather inflammatory quote at the end of the call that, at the end of the day, has

no bearing here.

THE COURT: I guess I'm trying to understand

Mr. Haney's comment that it's Mr. Sood and Mr. Dawkins laughing

at the undercover. I thought that the whole scheme here was to

pay off the coaches.

MR. HANEY: Your Honor, you could listen to this one phone call and determine very clearly that is not the scheme. And Munish Sood, despite what he's going to testify to, he's on a wiretap recording with my client laughing about why Jeff D'Angelo's paying Book Richardson \$5,000 when Book Richardson's going to send players to them anyway. Jeff D'Angelo -- I'm sorry, Munish Sood actually says during that call: He's dying man. He's dying. Don't wake him up. Don't wake up Jeff D'Angelo because he's stupid enough to pay Book Richardson. And then Munish Sood says: Let's get him back to the hotel at 6 o'clock and stroke him off some more.

THE COURT: Wasn't Munish Sood also paying coaches?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Yes, yeah. This is one call.

There's many events around it and that follow that make clear their paying coaches and they actually expect something in return for that. But, obviously, that's going to be for the jury to decide, ultimately. So --

MR. HANEY: Your Honor, Munish Sood and Marty Blazer were paying coaches for their financial planning outfit.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: At the end of the day, these are

jury arguments. We're letting the call in, so Mr. Haney's going to be able to make whatever arguments he wants. Yes, it's true, during this call they made fun of Jeff D'Angelo. Nobody' denying that. The reason they're making fun of him, Mr. Sood can explain that on direct examination. He seems to be head over heels that they've introduced him to a coach.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Is the government objecting to Mr. Haney's use of the latter portion of this tape during his cross-examination?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: We don't think he should be allowed to offer that part of the tape, no. He can ask Mr. Sood on cross-examination questions generally about what conversations he had with Dawkins, but we don't think that that's a basis to admit that portion of the tape.

THE COURT: What's your objection to this portion of the tape? Is it relevance?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: It's a combination of relevance and also hearsay. Just because — the defense is quite limited under the Rules of Evidence in what recordings they can offer themselves. There's limited exceptions. This part of the recording doesn't fall under any of them.

MR. HANEY: Just briefly, your Honor, without the word "more," perhaps he has an argument, right? If he says, "Let's stroke him off," perhaps he has an argument. When he says, "Let's stroke him off a little more," he's referencing, like we

did earlier today when we stroked him off to give Book

Richardson, your buddy, \$5,000 when it -- he's going to give

his coaches anyway. So, clearly, "let's stroke him off a

little more" is coming out of Munish Sood's mouth, not

Christian Dawkins. He's talking about getting D'Angelo back to

the hotel so they can continue to scam him like they did

throughout the entire scheme.

Thank you, your Honor. Your Honor, I would simply note, in closing, that when you look at Rule 106, I do not believe that Mr. Solowiejczyk's interpretation of Rule 106 is correct. It says if a party introduces all or part of a writing or recorded statement, an adverse party may require the introduction at that time of any other part or any other writing or recorded statement that, in fairness, ought to be considered at the same time. I actually think that all of the recordings that we seek to show, seek to introduce here, not only during the cross-examination of this witness but the recordings that we seek to play in the defense case, are covered by Rule 106. Fairness ought to be considered is the standard.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, there's a lot of law on the rule of completeness, and what Mr. Moore just said is not really a totally accurate statement. But we're happy, if your Honor's actually considering driving a bus through the hearsay exception using the rule of completeness, we're happy to send a

letter that will make very clear that that's not what the defense is allowed to do. The Rules of Evidence exist for a reason.

THE COURT: Yes, at the end of the day, this decision is not going to be driven by the rule of completeness because I think, first of all, the jury now has been trained to learn that these conversations are coming in piecemeal. And if, at the end of the day, the defense is going to be allowed to use it, they can use it in their cross-examination, and I don't think they would be prejudiced in the least by not having it played during the the government's direct. But I will reserve for now so that I can read these things a little bit more closely.

What about the instructions to the jury?

MR. CHANEY: Yes. Your Honor, we submitted those now, instead of at the conclusion of the trial, because I think both instructions are appropriate to be given to the jury sort of contemporaneously with their receiving the evidence that we're sort of — that's being admitted for a limited purpose. If I had thought about it more in advance, I think it would have been appropriate at the beginning of Mr. Sood's testimony, contemporaneous with or immediately before Mr. Solowiejczyk asked Mr. Sood whether or not he had pleaded guilty in participation of the very conduct that we're talking about in this case.

So I think the limiting instruction with respect to the codefendant plea is ripe now and something that the jury should be instructed about when they come in this morning. I think, additionally, to the extent — and I believe that this is going to happen — that we go back through any of the recordings that involve statements by Mr. D'Angelo or Ms. Bailey, that a contemporaneous reading of the hearsay limiting instruction would be appropriate at that time.

My sort of review of what the government's response to the defense instructions were is that it really goes more to the language choices, the phraseology of those instructions, and not so much the content. So I think the parties agree that the content's appropriate.

THE COURT: Mr. Mark?

MR. MARK: I wouldn't say the parties agree. There's a lot of unnecessary language in the defendants' instructions. These were obvious issues that were going to come up at trial. Obviously, the defense just sort of sprung this in now at this moment, which is quite late for sort of obvious issues that are going to come up. The government proposed these as part of its request to charge. It's standard in this district that this sort of instruction would come in at a request to charge, not sort of disjunctively in the middle of trial. So we would object to them being instructed at this point in time. But to the consideration the Court is considering whether to have any

instructions, we would sort of rest on our submission as to what would be an appropriate instruction.

THE COURT: I'm happy to use the government's proposal, and I think it's appropriate to let the jury know now. So I will give the two instructions that the government submitted. I do agree the point is the same, but we'll go with that. I'll do that when the jury comes out. OK.

MR. MARK: Your Honor, the government has some other matters, but I think we'll wait till a later break.

THE COURT: If the jury's here, we're going to start.

Is Mr. Sood here?

MR. VOURDERIS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Can we bring him in.

MR. MOORE: Your Honor, could I ask, because I'm going to pay attention to Juror No. 3, could I ask that your Honor keep an eye on her because at some point, if she continues to fall asleep, we may have an application.

THE COURT: Very well. Are we good to go?

MR. CHANEY: We are, Judge.

THE COURT: OK.

(Continued on next page)

(Jury present)

THE COURT: Everyone please be seated.

Ladies and gentlemen, good morning. Thank you, as always, for being prompt. I trust you all had a restful and pleasant weekend. We're going to begin -- continue presently with the direct examination of Mr. Sood. However, before we do that, there's just a couple of instructions that I need to give you on the law so that you bear it in mind as you continue to listen to the testimony.

First of all, you have heard testimony from Mr. Sood that he pled guilty to charges arising out of the same facts as this case. You are instructed that you are to draw no conclusions or inferences of any kind about the guilt of Mr. Sood or about the guilt of any defendant on trial from the fact that Mr. Sood pled guilty to similar charges. Mr. Sood's decision to plead guilty was a personal decision about his own guilt. It may not be used by you in any way as evidence against or unfavorable to the defendant on trial here, OK?

Secondly, you have also heard and seen videotapes of meetings involving undercover FBI agents. You are instructed that the statements by the undercover law enforcement witnesses are being admitted not for the truth, but, rather, to put in context statements by the defendants and by coconspirators. We couldn't redact the statements of the under undercovers out even though they're not evidence because that way you would not

4

5

Sood - Direct

- be able to make sense of the conversation if you were only hearing half of the conversation. So these statements are being provided simply so that you have the conversation in
 - With that, Mr. Solowiejczyk.
- 6 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Thank you, your Honor.
- 7 MUNISH SOOD, resumed.

could context.

- 8 DIRECT EXAMINATION CONTINUED
- 9 BY MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK:
- 10 Q. Good morning, Mr. Sood.
- 11 | A. Good morning.
- 12 | Q. Just to reorient the jury, I think when you testified on
- 13 | Friday, Mr. Sood, you spoke about attending an NBA draft party?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. What player was that for?
- 16 A. PJ Dozier.
- 17 | Q. Who facilitated the introduction for you to PJ Dozier?
- 18 A. Christian Dawkins.
- 19 Q. Was there a coach involved in that introduction as well?
- 20 A. Yes, Lamont Evans.
- 21 | Q. I believe you testified that PJ Dozier went undrafted, is
- 22 | that right?
- 23 A. Correct.
- 24 | Q. After the draft party, did you speak to Christian Dawkins
- 25 | about it?

J4THDaw1 Sood - Direct

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Was that by phone?
- 3 A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, at this time the government offers Government Exhibit 106 and 106T pursuant to the authenticity stipulation.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. HANEY: No objection, your Honor.

MR. MOORE: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: 106 and T will be admitted.

(Government's Exhibits 106 and 106T received in

12 evidence)

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: This is a June 23, 2017, call between Christian Dawkins and Munish Sood.

(Audio played)

- 16 BY MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK:
- 17 Q. All right. Mr. Sood, just a couple questions for you about
- 18 | that recording. If you could take a look back first, Mr. Sood,
- 19 and we're going to talk about this a few minutes, but by
- 20 June 23, 2017, had you started a new company with Christian
- 21 | Dawkins?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. Take a look at page 3, and I'm going to direct your attention specifically to lines 6 through 9.
- 25 Mr. Sood, during this part of the conversation, what

Sood - Direct

- 1 | were you telling Christian Dawkins?
- 2 A. That Lamont Evans had advised PJ Dozier to work with
- 3 Christian Dawkins and the new firm; but, rather, they went with
- 4 | a different agent.
- 5 | Q. Did you have a conversation with Lamont Evans to that
- 6 effect?
- 7 | A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Prior to the draft, Mr. Sood, had you had any discussions
- 9 | with Christian Dawkins regarding recruiting PJ Dozier as a
- 10 | client?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Now, Mr. Sood, at this time, June 23, 2017, what, if
- 13 | anything, did you know about if anyone had previously paid
- 14 | Lamont Evans?
- 15 A. That Lamont Evans was paid by Christian Dawkins and Marty
- 16 | Blazer.
- 17 | Q. And soon after this call did you, in fact, pay Lamont
- 18 Evans?
- 19 | A. I did.
- 20 | Q. Why'd you pay him?
- 21 | A. One of the reasons was because he helped set this meeting
- 22 | up with the family, and then two was he was -- Marty had been
- 23 | asking me to pay him for a while.
- Q. When you say "the family," who do you mean?
- 25 A. Mother.

J4THDaw1 Sood - Direct

- 1 | Q. Of who?
- $2 \parallel A$. The mom.
- 3 | Q. Which player?
- 4 A. PJ Dozier.
- 5 | Q. Mr. Sood, at page 4 you talked about a couple other
- 6 players. You mentioned somebody named Kyle. Who was that?
- 7 A. Kyle Kuzma.
- 8 | Q. And you mentioned somebody made Davon. Who that is?
- 9 A. Davon Reed.
- 10 | Q. Then you mentioned someone named Patton. Who was that?
- 11 A. Justin Patton.
- 12 | Q. All right. Mr. Sood, around this time in late June 2017,
- 13 | did you see Mr. Evans again in person?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. Do you recall where that occurred?
- 16 A. New York. Manhattan, New York City.
- 17 | Q. Mr. Sood, if I told you it might be Miami, Florida, would
- 18 | that sound correct to you?
- 19 | A. Oh, yes, sorry.
- 20 MR. HANEY: Objection. Testifying. Leading.
- 21 THE COURT: Overruled.
- MR. HANEY: Thank you.
- 23 Q. Did you inform Christian Dawkins about the fact you were
- 24 going to be seeing Lamont Evans?
- 25 A. Yes.

Sood - Direct

- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: If we could just show the witness,

 Ms. Bustillo, Government Exhibit 1632B. If you could zoom in a

 little bit.
 - Q. You also have a binder in front of you, Mr. Sood, to the extent that's easier.

Do you recognize this document?

A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

- Q. What is it?
- 9 A. It's a text message exchange between myself and Christian.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, the government offers 11 1632B.
- 12 THE COURT: Any objection?
- MR. HANEY: No objection, your Honor.
- 14 THE COURT: 1632B will be received.
- 15 (Government's Exhibit 1632B received in evidence)
- 16 BY MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK:
- Q. All right. Mr. Sood, when the messages say "direction incoming," who are those messages from?
- 19 A. They're from me.
- 20 | Q. When it says "outgoing," who are those messages from?
- 21 A. Christian.
- 22 | Q. I want to start by directing your attention to the top
- 23 message. I believe you -- could you just read that message,
- 24 | actually. This is from you, right?
- 25 A. Oh. "Good. Just saw Lamont in Miami. On my way to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Sood - Direct

- Bolivia. You guys should sit down. Jeff funding him, so we may as well take advantage of it."
 - MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, could you zoom in on that, on that one message, please.
 - Q. Mr. Sood, when you said this, what did you mean by it?
 - A. That Christian should sit down with Lamont to figure out what players he can be recommending to us at the new company.
 - Q. Mr. Sood, when you said, "Jeff funding him, so we may as well take advantage of it," what did you mean by "take
- 10 advantage of it"?
- 11 A. Since Jeff was giving money to Lamont Evans, we should be seeing some results from this relationship.
- 13 Q. What kind of results?
- 14 A. Like access to players.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: All right. You can zoom out,
- 16 Ms. Bustillo.
- Q. Going further down the page, if you could zoom in on that middle portion.
- 19 Q. Dawkins said to you, "I need my money back on PJ. He's got
- 20 | 650. Lamont has it." Did you understand what Dawkins meant?
- 21 A. That Lamont Evans owed Christian \$650.
- 22 | Q. For what?
- 23 A. More money he must have advanced him in -- previously.
- 24 | Q. For which player?
- 25 A. For PJ Dozier.

Sood - Direct

- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: You can zoom out, Ms. Bustillo.

 Q. Going down to the bottom of the page, starting with the
- 3 message that says, "No, Lamont can pay me back," when
- 4 Mr. Dawkins said to you, "No, Lamont can pay me back. I
- funneled the money through him," did you understand what he
- 6 meant?
- A. That he had given money to PJ or his family through Lamont

 Evans, so he should pay him back, pay Christian back.
- 9 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: OK. You can take that down.
- 10 Q. Mr. Sood, on Friday I think you had started to talk about
- 11 conversations you were having with Christian Dawkins about
- 12 starting a new company?
- 13 A. Correct.
- 14 | Q. And around this time, I believe you said Mr. Dawkins had
- 15 | left ASM Sports, right?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Can you generally describe, Mr. Sood, what the business
- 18 model was going to be for this new company?
- 19 A. The business model was really to represent college players
- 20 who were turning pro, helping them identify sports agents,
- 21 | financial advisers, accountants, marketing; and in return, we
- 22 | would receive a portion of the fees from the service providers.
- 23 | Q. I believe you testified that you introduced a new potential
- 24 | investor to Mr. Dawkins, right?
- 25 A. Yes.

J4THDaw1 Sood - Direct

- 1 Q. Who was that?
- 2 A. Jeff D'Angelo.
- 3 | Q. And you met Mr. D'Angelo through Marty Blazer?
- 4 A. Correct.
- 5 | Q. What did you -- who did you understand Jeff D'Angelo was at
- 6 | the time you first met him?
- 7 A. Wealthy businessman in real estate.
- 8 | Q. What did you later learn about him?
- 9 A. That he was undercover FBI agent.
- 10 | Q. When did you learn that?
- 11 A. When I was arrested.
- 12 Q. Mr. Sood, when were you are arrested?
- 13 A. September 26, '17.
- 14 | Q. On the day of your arrest, did you speak with law
- 15 | enforcement voluntarily?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. Were you questioned about your activities involving college
- 18 | basketball?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. Mr. Sood, during that interview, were you asked about
- 21 certain payments that you had made to coaches and others?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. Were you truthful about those subjects at that time?
- 24 A. No.
- 25 Q. Mr. Sood, what sorts of things did you lie about on the day

Sood - Direct

- 1 of your arrest?
- 2 A. The number of coaches that were paid and the dollar amount
- 3 to family members.
- 4 | Q. Why did you lie, Mr. Sood?
- 5 A. I was scared. I didn't want to get caught.
- Q. After you were arrested, did you later decide to cooperate
- 7 | with law enforcement?
- 8 | A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Did you participate in meetings with the government?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. Who else was present for those meetings?
- 12 A. My attorney.
- 13 | Q. At those meetings, did you tell the government the truth
- 14 | about what you did?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. At those meetings, were you required to tell the government
- 17 | about any other wrongdoing you were involved in?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. As part of your cooperation with the government, have you
- 20 also met with another U.S. Attorney's Office regarding a
- 21 separate investigation?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. Generally, what was the subject of those interviews?
- 24 | A. That was regarding commercial loans done during my tenure
- 25 as a director at a bank.

Sood - Direct

- 1 Q. Mr. Sood, are you aware whether there's an ongoing SEC
- 2 | investigation regarding your conduct?
- 3 | A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. What's your understanding regarding the status of that
- 5 | investigation?
- 6 A. That my attorneys are handling the discussions and the
- 7 | negotiations.
- 8 | Q. Did there come a time when you pleaded guilty?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Generally, what conduct did your guilty plea cover?
- 11 A. Bribing a coach and wire fraud.
- 12 | Q. What did the wire fraud relate to, generally?
- 13 A. Paying players and coaches.
- 14 | Q. Who were some of the coaches that you either paid yourself
- 15 or that you agreed to pay?
- 16 | A. Tony Bland, Emanuel Richardson, and Lamont Evans.
- 17 | Q. Did you have an agreement with the government at the time
- 18 | you pled guilty?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. What kind of agreement did you have?
- 21 A. A cooperation agreement.
- 22 | Q. Mr. Sood, what benefit were you hoping for as a result of
- 23 | the cooperation agreement?
- 24 A. To get the least sentence possible.
- 25 | Q. Have you met with the government in connection with your

J4THDaw1 Sood - Direct

- 1 | cooperation?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 | Q. Fair to say you've met with the government many times at
- 4 | this point?
- 5 | A. Yes, many times.
- 6 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: If we could just show for the
- 7 witness only, Ms. Bustillo, Government Exhibit 658.
- 8 Q. Do you recognize this document?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 \parallel Q. What is it?
- 11 A. The cooperation agreement.
- 12 | Q. Could you turn to the last page. Do you see your signature
- 13 on the agreement?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Government offers Government
- 16 | Exhibit 658.
- 17 THE COURT: Any objection?
- MR. HANEY: No objection.
- 19 MR. MOORE: No objection.
- 20 | THE COURT: 658 will be received.
- 21 (Government's Exhibit 658 received in evidence)
- 22 BY MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK:
- 23 | Q. Mr. Sood, what's your understanding of what you are
- 24 required to do under this agreement?
- 25 A. Required to tell the truth, provide information that's --

Sood - Direct

- that I have regarding the case, meet as required, and not
 commit any -- any crimes.
- Q. If you live up to your obligations under the cooperation
- 4 agreement, what's your understanding of what the government
- 5 | will do?
- 6 A. They will give my judge a 5K letter.
- 7 Q. What's your understanding of what information is contained
- 8 | in a 5K letter?
- 9 A. It contains the crimes I committed and also the help I
- 10 provided.
- 11 Q. What are you hoping will happen as a result of the
- 12 government writing that letter to the judge?
- 13 A. To get the least amount of sentence.
- 14 | Q. Will the government recommend a specific sentence to the
- 15 | judge?
- 16 A. No.
- 17 | Q. Mr. Sood, under this plea agreement, did you also receive
- 18 | immunity for anything?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | O. For what?
- 21 A. Lying to the FBI.
- 22 | Q. Was that on the day of your arrest?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. Does this agreement provide you any protection with respect
- 25 to the SEC investigation that you mentioned?

Sood - Direct

1 Α. No.

J4THDaw1

- 2 What's the highest possible sentence that you can receive
- for all of the crimes that you pleaded guilty to? 3
- Thirty-five years. 4 Α.
- 5 Is 35 years the maximum punishment even if the government
- writes the 5K letter? 6
- 7 Α. Yes.
- You also face financial penalties? 8
- 9 Α. Yes.
- 10 What's your understanding of who will ultimately decide
- 11 your sentence?
- 12 Α. Judge.
- 13 Is the judge required to give you a lower sentence if the 0.
- government writes the 5K letter? 14
- 15 Α. No.
- If you violate the cooperation agreement, do you believe 16
- 17 that the government will still write that letter to the judge?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Have you been promised that you will get a lower sentence
- 20 as a result of your cooperation?
- 21 Α. No.
- 22 Q. Have any promises been made to you about the sentence that
- you're going to get in this case? 23
- 24 Α. No.
- 25 Do you believe the outcome of this trial will have any

Sood - Direct

- effect whatsoever on whether the government writes that letter to the judge?
- 3 | A. No.
- Q. What's your understanding of what does matter under the agreement?
- 6 A. Tell the truth.
 - Q. What happens if you're not truthful here today?
- 8 A. The government will rip up the -- the cooperation letter.
 - Q. Are you still bound by your guilty plea at that point?
- 10 | A. Yes.

7

- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: You can take that down,
- 12 Ms. Bustillo.
- 13 | Q. Mr. Sood, I want to turn back to the formation of this new
- 14 company with Christian Dawkins and others. I think you were
- 15 | talking about a new investor named Jeff D'Angelo. Did there
- 16 come a time when you introduced Jeff D'Angelo to Christian
- 17 | Dawkins?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Do you recall where that happened?
- 20 A. I was in a restaurant in Manhattan, New York.
- 21 | Q. What was the purpose of that meeting?
- 22 | A. Just to introduce Christian to Jeff and then also discuss
- 23 | the new company he wanted to create.
- 24 | Q. What were you hoping was going to be the outcome of that
- 25 | meeting?

25

Sood - Direct

That Jeff would consider investing in the company. 1 Α. 2 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, at this time the government would offer Government Exhibits 506B through 506F 3 4 and 506BT through 506FT, which are recordings of a May 16, 5 2017, meeting and the associated transcripts. 6 THE COURT: Any objection? 7 No objection, your Honor. MR. HANEY: 8 MR. MOORE: No objection, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Those exhibits will be received. (Government's Exhibits 506B through 506F and 506BT 10 11 through 506FT received in evidence) 12 BY MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: 13 Q. Mr. Sood, prior to testifying here today, did you review a 14 recording of that meeting that you mentioned in Midtown 15 Manhattan? 16 Α. Yes. 17 At the time of the meeting, did you know it was being recorded? 18 19 A. No. 20 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: All right. If we could play, 21 Ms. Bustillo, Government Exhibit 506B. And this is a portion 22 of the May 16, 2017, meeting between Christian Dawkins, Munish 23 Sood, and Jeff D'Angelo. 24 (Audio played)

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Pause for one second.

2

5

- 1 | Q. Who's talking right now, Mr. Sood?
 - A. Christian Dawkins.
- 3 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, is it possible to
- 4 make it a little louder? Thank you.
 - (Audio played)
- 6 BY MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK:
- Q. Mr. Sood, what was Mr. Dawkins generally describing during that portion of the meeting?
- 9 A. He was just outlining the business strategy, which is give
- 10 potential player clients an option of three to four
- 11 | agents/advisers, so this way they have the ability to pick what
- 12 | makes the best sense. But we've done -- we've -- we would do
- 13 the sourcing so we can confirm which may be the best option for
- 14 them.
- Q. By doing the sourcing, how are you going to benefit from
- 16 | that financially?
- 17 A. Because then, regardless of the agents they choose, we
- 18 | would get a piece of the fees.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, if we could play the
- 20 next clip, which is another portion of the May 16, 2017,
- 21 | meeting, Government Exhibit 506C.
- 22 (Audio played)
- Q. OK. Mr. Sood, I just want to ask you a couple questions
- 24 about some of the conversation we just heard.
- 25 If you could go back to page 1, and specifically

5

20

21

22

23

24

25

- focusing you on lines 3 through 5, when Mr. Dawkins said, "The key to all of this stuff is controlling the assets, that's what it is. It sounds negative. It's the bottom up," did you understand what that meant?
 - A. He was referring to players.
- 6 Q. And what specifically was he telling you?
- 7 A. That if you can control the player, it will make it easier 8 for the player to work with us.
- 9 Q. During this part of the conversation, what generally was
 10 Dawkins discussing when it came to controlling the players?
- 11 A. That based on his relationships, he can start controlling 12 them as early as high school.
- Q. Now, there was some discussion during this part of the conversation regarding a player named Brian Bowen. Who is that?
- 16 A. A high school player.
- Q. Did you understand generally what Mr. Dawkins was telling
 you during this conversation regarding Brian Bowen's
 recruitment process?
 - A. That he was a highly -- a top prospect, but based on his relationship with Brian and also his relationship with other schools, he could leverage that relationship to secure a top 15 draft pick by sending that -- sending Brian Bowen to a particular school.
 - Q. When you said "he," who were you referring to?

Sood - Direct

- A. Christian.
- 2 | Q. What was the role, if any, of the college coaches in that?
- 3 A. They would then direct a top 15 player to Christian and the
- 4 new firm.

- 5 | Q. All right. Taking a look a little later in the
- 6 conversation at page 6, specifically referring to lines 11
- 7 | through about 18 or so, Mr. Dawkins said to you: "But some
- 8 coaches don't have nothing to do with it at all, and some
- 9 coaches have the guys with just exclusivity. And it's like,
- 10 | listen, you ain't -- if you ain't going with this guy, it's
- 11 going to make it a pretty F'ing fit, you know? I'm sure
- 12 | they're getting some not guilty return for that access."
- Did you understand what Mr. Dawkins was referring to
- 14 here?
- 15 A. That there were certain coaches who already had preexisting
- 16 relationships with agents and advisers, so it would be
- 17 | difficult for us to work with them, and then some coaches did
- 18 | not participate in taking money for referring players.
- 19 Q. When Mr. Dawkins said, "I'm sure they're getting something
- 20 | in return for that access," did you understand what that meant?
- 21 | A. Money.
- 22 | Q. Who was getting money?
- $23 \parallel A$. The coaches.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, if we could now play
- 25 Government Exhibit 506D, which is another portion of the

Sood - Direct

May 16, 2017, meeting between Christian Dawkins, Jeff D'Angelo, and Munish Sood.

(Audio played)

BY MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK:

Q. Mr. Sood, just looking back at page 1 of the transcript, and specifically the statement by Mr. Dawkins, it starts at line 23 and runs through the top of page 2, he said to you, "You got a relationship with them. Let's say, for instance, someone's recruiting LeBron James and you're his guy. He may say, Look, and so I can get you LeBron. I got the kid. I need to get some financing to get everything done. You come in, you take care of him, and it's your kid."

Did you understand what Mr. Dawkins was referring to here?

- A. That he's giving example of how a coach may -- would require money to pay a handler or a -- someone that's related to him. In this case, he used LeBron as an example, in order to convince LeBron to go to the schools where the coach is coaching.
- Q. If somebody provided that financing to the coach, what, if anything, would be the result of that?
- A. Having access to that player.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, if we could go to Government Exhibit 506E, we can play this one. Thank you.

(Audio played)

3

9

10

20

21

22

- Q. Mr. Sood, there was some mention to Lamont. Who were you referring to there?
 - A. Lamont Evans.
- 4 | Q. Where was he coaching at that time?
- 5 A. He was at, sorry, Oklahoma State.
- Q. What, if anything, was Dawkins saying during this portion of the meeting regarding how Lamont Evans had gotten the job at Oklahoma State?
 - A. That he, Christian, had helped use his relationship to help Lamont get the job at Oklahoma State and a better salary.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: If we could go to 506F,

 Ms. Bustillo.
- 13 (Audio played)
- Q. All right. Mr. Sood, going back to page 2, when Dawkins said to you, "If we're taking care of everybody and everything is done, we control everything. That's why I said it doesn't make sense to -- what's the extra five grand when you can make millions off of one kid? That's what I'm saying," what did you understand that to mean, Mr. Sood?
 - A. That if we paid the -- if we provided money to the right -- the right people, coaches or family members or both, that would position us to retain a client, retain a player when he goes pro, and the returns were very -- were great.
- Q. Going to page 3, Mr. Sood, starting at line 4 of that page,
 Mr. Dawkins says to you, "If we have the coaches, that means

Sood - Direct

- you can save us money and expenses having to F'ing go down
 there and hold the guy's Dick. If we don't have the coaches,
 that means I have to be in that city every month or two weeks,"
 what did you understand that to mean, Mr. Sood?
 - A. With working with the coaches, they would have influence over the player and they would keep other agents away. And then, also, it would be easier for us to maintain the relationships since we can't be there every day.
- 9 Q. Now, Mr. Sood, after this initial meeting with Jeff
 10 D'Angelo and Christian Dawkins, did you have additional
 11 discussions with Mr. D'Angelo about the possibility of
- 12 | investing?
- 13 A. Yes.

5

6

7

- 14 Q. Soon after that did you have another meeting with him?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | 0. Where did that occur?
- 17 A. In New York City.
- 18 Q. Mr. Sood, was Mr. Blazer also present for that meeting?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. Now, during that meeting, did there come a point when you
- 21 spoke to Christian Dawkins?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. How did you do that?
- 24 A. Via phone.
- 25 | Q. Were you holding the phone to your ear or did you have him

1 on speakerphone?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. It was a conference call. He was on speaker.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: At this time, your Honor, the government would offer Government Exhibit 507.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. HANEY: No objection, your Honor.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: And the related transcript, 507T. And government offers it at this time, your Honor.

THE COURT: There being no objection, it will be received.

(Government's Exhibits 507 and 507T received in evidence)

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, when you're ready, if you could play Government Exhibit 507 and the associated transcript, 507T.

(Audio played)

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Can you pause it. You can keep going, Ms. Bustillo, when you're ready.

(Audio played)

BY MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK:

Q. All right. Mr. Sood, if you could turn back to page 1 of the transcript, and focusing your attention on lines 16 through 21, you said, "You know one of the things that we want to confirm is that you work closely with, like, guys like Lamont, Book, and they become a good resource for us and they -- you

4

5

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

Sood - Direct

- 1 know, it's a good way to make sure that kids work for us."
- 2 Who is Lamont and who is Book?
- 3 A. Lamont was Lamont Evans and Book was Emanuel Richardson.
 - Q. Where did Emanuel Richardson coach at that time?
 - A. University of Arizona.
- Q. During this phone call, what were you asking Dawkins for specifically?
 - A. List of his relationships and coaches that he'd want to work with.
 - Q. At that time why was that relevant to you, Mr. Sood?
- 11 A. To figure out how much money he may require to -- for them
 12 to recruit players.
 - Q. Looking at page 4, specifically lines 2 through 9, you said to Mr. Dawkins, "So part of the solution we want to provide is like what we do with Lamont. Is -- you know, you introduce us to Lamont; you introduce me to Book. We go to them and say, how can we help you outside of, you know, what we're talking
- 19 What did you mean by that, Mr. Sood?

about on the business side?"

- A. That we were going to be providing them money for recruiting if they will need any type of resources.
- Q. Why did you specifically mention Lamont and Book in that context?
- A. Because those are two coaches that I had met with and had spoken with.

25

evidence)

Sood - Direct

1 Mr. Sood, by this point, May 2017, what, if anything, did 2 you understand regarding the types of monetary needs that assistance coaches might have? 3 They had monetary needs to recruit. Some of them were 4 Α. 5 using their own moneys, but if we could provide that, if we could provide the money, then we get access to their players. 6 7 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: You can take that down, Ms. Bustillo. 8 Q. Mr. Sood, during these ongoing discussions with Jeff 9 D'Angelo about investing, were you in frequent contact with 10 11 Christian Dawkins during that time? 12 Α. Yes. 13 Did you keep him apprised of the discussions you were 0. 14 having with D'Angelo about his investment? 15 Α. Yes. 16 Did you speak to him regularly by phone? 0. 17 Α. Yes. 18 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: At this time, your Honor, the government would offer Government Exhibit 203 and 203T. 19 20 THE COURT: Any objection? 21 MR. HANEY: No objection, your Honor. 22 MR. MOORE: No objection. 23 THE COURT: 203 and 203T will be received. 24 (Government's Exhibits 203 and 203T received in

J4THDaw1 Sood - Direct

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: This is a May 31, 2017, phone call between Munish Sood and Christian Dawkins.

(Audio played)

BY MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK:

- Q. All right. Mr. Sood, turning back to page 2 of the transcript, you said to Mr. Dawkins, this is at line 5, "While you're sitting on the plane, can you send us a list of the coaches, you know, that's most important to us, your top ten or top 15 coaches that, you know, we could be working with going forward, or whatever the number maybe." What were you asking Mr. Dawkins for at this point?
- A. A list of coaches that we would want to engage to recruit.
- Q. When you say "engage," what do you mean, Mr. Sood?
- A. That may require money to help them secure players.

(Continued on next page)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. You then went on to say at page 2, line 20, "We're helping Lamont out right so we're helping Lamont with his recruiting."

 What were you telling Dawkins here?
 - A. That similar to Lamont Evans who was receiving money for recruiting.
 - Q. Similar to what, sorry?
 - A. Sorry. The coaches may want money as well to recruit.
 - Q. And then at line -- page 2, line 24 you said, "So as Jeff has mentioned, Marty has mentioned, we don't mind, we don't mind helping coaches out if it helps the overall cause."
- 11 What did you mean by "overall cause," Mr. Sood?
- 12 A. That in return we'll be receiving clients.
 - Q. Now, when Mr. Dawkins said to you at -- further down on that page, line 8, "Lamont is not even on the same stratosphere as some of the other guys that I was just listing." Did you understand what he meant by that?
 - A. That even though Lamont Evans worked for a good college basketball program he had relationships with other coaches that worked at better, high-rated programs.
 - Q. Then finally, Mr. Sood, you said a little further down, line 20, "But that's -- still we want to know. So we want to know where we want to use our money."
- 23 Do you see that?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- 25 Q. What did that mean?

- 1 A. Again, we wanted a list to know how much we should be
- 2 budgeting -- how much we required for the number of coaches he
- 3 was thinking of working with.
- 4 | Q. Mr. Sood, after this call, did Mr. Dawkins, in fact, send
- 5 you a list of coaches?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: And if we could just publish for
- 8 the witness only, Ms. Bustillo, Government Exhibit 655.
- 9 Q. Do you recognize this document?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. What is it?
- 12 A. It's an e-mail from Christian.
- 13 | O. To whom?
- 14 A. To myself.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, the government offers
- 16 Government Exhibit 655.
- MR. HANEY: No objection, your Honor.
- 18 MR. CHANEY: No objection, your Honor.
- 19 | THE COURT: 655 will be received.
- 20 (Government's Exhibit 655 received in evidence)
- 21 | Q. So, Mr. Sood, if you could just walk us through the header
- 22 of the e-mail. Who is it from?
- 23 | A. It's from Christian. It's dated Wednesday, May 31, 2017.
- 24 The subject: Coaches. It's to my e-mail.
- 25 | Q. Mr. Dawkins said these are my main guys. What does he list

J4T9DAW2 Sood - Direct

- 1 underneath that?
- 2 A. A list of coaches.
- 3 Q. So I just want to walk through the list with you briefly,
- 4 Mr. Sood.
- 5 It says Arizona, Sean Miller. Future hall of fame.
- 6 And then Emanuel Book Richardson superstar.
- 7 Did you know who Sean Miller was at that time?
 - A. The head coach of the University of Arizona.
- 9 Q. By this time had you met Emanuel Book Richardson?
- 10 | A. Yes.

- 11 Q. What does it say about him?
- 12 A. Superstar.
- 13 Q. Going a little further down that first page there's a
- 14 reference to Creighton?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. And there's someone named Preston Murphy?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Who did you understand that to be at the time?
- 19 A. Another superstar.
- 20 Q. Beyond that, what was his job?
- 21 A. Assistant coach.
- 22 | Q. And a little further down it says USC?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. Tony Bland. What was your understanding of who he was at
- 25 | that time?

- 1 A. Also an assistant coach.
- 2 | Q. At which school?
- 3 A. USC, University of Southern California.
- 4 | Q. Had Dawkins previously mentioned Bland to you?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And what did he say about Bland at that time?
- 7 A. It was a good relationship of his, well connected, and
- 8 | had -- and had a great recruiting class coming up.
- 9 Q. Did you eventually meet with Mr. Bland in person?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Besides Tony Bland and Book Richardson, did you ever
- 12 personally meet with any of the other coaches on this list?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 | Q. Mr. Sood, after receiving this list, what was your
- 15 | reaction?
- 16 A. Seemed like a very impressive list.
- 17 | Q. What did you do with the list after you received it?
- 18 A. I forwarded it to Jeff D'Angelo.
- 19 Q. Now, Mr. Sood, after this phonecall and after Mr. Dawkins
- 20 | sent you this list, did there come a point soon after when
- 21 | Mr. D'Angelo did agree to invest in the new company?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. And did there come a time when you formalized an agreement
- 24 amongst yourselves with respect to that, his investment and
- 25 | your investment?

J4T9DAW2 Sood - Direct

- 1 | A. Yes.
- Q. And Mr. Sood, to be clear, you also invested in this
- 3 company, correct?
- 4 A. I did. I was a shareholder.
- 5 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: So if you could publish just for 6 the witness Government Exhibit 623.
- Q. Do you recognize that document, Mr. Sood, once you've turned to it.?
 - I think it's also on your screen.
- 10 | A. Yes, I do.

- 11 \square Q. What is it?
- 12 A. It's the shareholder agreement between myself, Christian,
 13 and Jeff D'Angelo.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, the government offers

 Government Exhibit 623.
- MR. HANEY: No objection, your Honor. Thank you.
- 17 MR. CHANEY: No objection.
- 18 THE COURT: 623 will be received.
- 19 (Government's Exhibit 623 received in evidence)
- 20 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, if we could turn
- 21 to -- I think it's page 8 of 9 of the document, the second to
- 22 | last page.
- 23 | Q. Who are the signatories to the agreement, Mr. Sood?
- 24 A. Christian, Jeff, and myself.
- 25 | Q. And what were you and Jeff D'Angelo listed as?

J4T9DAW2 Sood - Direct

- 1 A. Shareholders.
- 2 | Q. Who did Mr. Dawkins sign on behalf of?
- 3 A. The company, Loyd, Inc.
- 4 Q. Did you meet in person to sign this agreement?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 | Q. Where did that meeting occur?
- 7 A. In Manhattan, New York.
- 8 \parallel Q. And where in particular?
- 9 A. It was on a boat in downtown.
- Q. Mr. Sood, if you could go back to I think it's the fourth page of the document. It's the one ending in 0601.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: If we could zoom in, Ms. Bustillo, on the fifth provision, "Loan to Loyd, Inc."
- Q. Under the terms of this agreement, who, if anyone, was going to be providing a loan to the new company?
- 16 A. Jeff D'Angelo will provide \$185,000 I would provide 40,000.
- Q. And at the time, Mr. Sood, did you agree to provide those
- funds, what was your understanding about how they were going to
- 19 be used?
- 20 A. They would be used to give money to players, coaches, and
- 21 then also for general expenses.
- 22 | Q. Directing your attention to the last page of the document.
- 23 | There's a schedule here?
- 24 A. Yes.

25

Q. What percentage stake were you going to be receiving in the

- 1 | company?
- 2 A. Fifteen.
- 3 Q. And what percentage stake was Mr. D'Angelo going to be
- 4 | receiving?
- 5 A. Thirty-five.
- 6 | Q. How about Mr. Dawkins?
- 7 \parallel A. Fifty.
- 8 | Q. What was your understanding regarding why Dawkins was
- 9 getting the greatest percentage?
- 10 A. Because he would be the president and also running the
- 11 company day-to-day.
- 12 | Q. If you could go back to the sixth page of the document
- 13 which is the document ending in 0603, the page ending in 0603.
- 14 Looking at the bottom of the page, what city was
- 15 correspondence to be sent to Christian Dawkins?
- 16 A. Atlanta, Georgia.
- 17 | Q. Where did you understand he was living at that time?
- 18 A. In Atlanta.
- 19 Q. Looking at the next page, where was correspondence to be
- 20 sent to Jeff D'Angelo?
- 21 A. New York.
- 22 \parallel Q. Where did you understand that he resided at that time?
- 23 A. New York.
- 24 | Q. Mr. Sood, did you end up putting up part of the money
- 25 | that's described in this agreement?

J4T9DAW2 Sood - Direct

- 1 A. I did. Ten thousand.
- 2 Q. Mr. Sood, by putting up that money and signing this
- 3 agreement formally becoming a shareholder in the company what
- 4 was your ultimate goal?
- 5 A. To recruit players as clients.
- 6 Q. Now, at the time you signed this agreement you mentioned
- 7 you met on a boat. Were you aware that that meeting was being
- 8 recorded?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 | Q. Did you review a recording of that meeting before
- 11 | testifying?
- 12 | A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Generally, what was discussed at the meeting, Mr. Sood?
- 14 A. Just the strategy of the company, the players, the coaches
- 15 | that we were going to focus on and how we would grow the
- 16 company going forward.
- MR. HANEY: Your Honor, may we approach.
- 18 THE COURT: Yes.
- 19 MR. HANEY: Thank you, your Honor.
- 20 (Continued on next page)

21

22

23

24

J4T9DAW2 Sood - Direct (At the sidebar) MR. HANEY: My client has informed me if we don't take a five-minute break something embarrassing is going to happen to my client. THE COURT: OK. We'll take a five-minute break. MR. HANEY: I apologize, your Honor. THE COURT: No problem. (Continued on next page)

J4T9DAW2 Sood - Direct

1 (In open court)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take a five-minute break. Don't discuss the case.

(Recess)

THE COURT: Mr. Solowiejczyk.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Thank you, your Honor.

- Q. Mr. Sood, I believe we were talking about the meeting on the boat when you signed the shareholder agreement. So, I was asking you if you knew the meeting was being recorded?
- 10 | A. No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- 11 Q. Did you review a recording of the meeting before testifying 12 today?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Generally speaking, what was discussed during the meeting?
- 15 A. Just the business strategy, where Christian -- what
- 16 players, coaches he wanted to focus on and really what the
- 17 | outlook of the company would be.
- 18 | Q. Did you bring anyone with you to the meeting?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | O. Who was that?
- 21 A. It was my assistant.
- 22 | Q. What's her name?
- 23 A. Alicia Carroll.
- 24 | Q. And did Mr. D'Angelo bring anyone to the meeting with him?
- 25 A. Yes.

Sood - Direct

- Q. Who was that?
- 2 A. One of his business partners named Jill Bailey.
- 3 | Q. And did you later learn anything about Ms. Bailey?
- 4 A. Yes.

- 5 | Q. What did you learn?
- 6 A. That she was an undercover FBI agent as well.
- 7 | Q. Was Mr. Dawkins at the meeting?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And was Mr. Blazer there?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: So this is already in evidence,
- 12 | your Honor, but we're going to play a couple of short excerpts
- 13 | from it again.
- 14 THE COURT: Very well.
- 15 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: This is Government Exhibit 508A but
- 16 | we're actually going to start at page 5, line 1 of that
- 17 | transcript.
- I will just give the jurors a moment to get there.
- 19 It's 508A and we're starting at page 5, line 1.
- 20 Ms. Bustillo, you can go ahead. Thank you.
- 21 (Video played)
- 22 | Q. Mr. Sood, during this portion of the meeting who was being
- 23 discussed specifically?
- 24 A. PJ Dozier and Lamont Evans.
- 25 Q. Looking at page 6, lines 6 through 10, when Mr. Blazer

Sood - Direct

- said, "Because I just like when we were in Miami, I never stopped. When you set that into motion with him and doing what he needed to have done and I never backed away from that," what did you understand that to mean at the time?
 - A. That Marty Blazer was paying Lamont Evans a monthly retainer.
 - Q. What was your understanding at that time regarding whether the new company that you were forming was going to have a relationship with Lamont Evans?
- 10 A. It would.

5

6

7

8

9

19

- 11 | Q. And what would that relationship entail?
- 12 A. Continue to pay that retainer to Lamont Evans.
- Q. And what did you understand would be -- you would get in return for that?
- 15 A. Access to his players.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: If we could do another short

 portion from this same exhibit and we're going to be turning to

 page 11, line 14.
 - I'm just going to give the jurors a moment to get there, Mr. Sood.
- 21 OK. Thank you, Ms. Bustillo.
- 22 (Video played)
- Q. Mr. Sood, just going back, if you could take a look at page 12, lines 16 through 17. Mr. Dawkins asked, "what is he
- 25 | getting Lamont?"

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

25

- And Blazer responded, "We're -- we just -- we're going to do three, and he's gonna do one." What was that exchange about?
 - A. At that time Lamont was getting three thousand from Marty Blazer and Jeff and I was supposed to be giving a thousand.
 - Q. Had you spoken to Blazer and D'Angelo about that in advance of the meeting?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Now, staying right around there, at page 12, lines 23 to 24, Mr. Dawkins said to you and the others, "Lamont is good, but like he's not -- he's not the elite, elite dudes."
- 12 What did you understand Mr. Dawkins to be saying?
- 13 A. That even though Lamont Evans was a good coach he wasn't

 14 sure if he was worth four thousand dollars a month.
- Q. Did Dawkins provide you with any examples of coaches he considered elite?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. Who were those?
- 19 A. Emanuel Richardson as one.
- Q. And what did you understand Dawkins was saying, if
 anything, regarding the difference between a coach like Emanuel
- 22 Richardson and Lamont Evans?
- A. The difference is Emanuel Richardson would have access to multiple top-tier players every year.
 - Q. During this portion of the conversation was there any

Sood - Direct

- discussion regarding specific players that Mr. Richardson was seeking to recruit?
- 3 A. A player by the name of DeAndre Ayton.
- Q. What was your general understanding of what Dawkins was saying about the recruitment of these players?
- A. That it made more sense to pay Emanuel a retainer, monthly fee, so we could get access to that caliber of a player.
- Q. Now, Mr. Sood, the conversation that we're listening to right now, did that occur on the same day that you signed the Loyd shareholder agreement?
- 11 A. Yes.
- Q. And in that agreement you agreed to invest some of your own money, right?
- 14 | A. Yes.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. At that time what was your understanding of what the strategy was going to be going forward to recruit clients for the business?
- A. Provide money to coaches and families and the players as needed.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, if we could go to the next clip of this exhibit which we're going to start at page 16, line 13 of the transcript.
- Q. Mr. Sood, if we could turn back to page 16 and focusing your attention on lines 19 through 24.
- 25 When Mr. Dawkins said, "I say you do this to make it

5

6

7

8

9

15

18

19

20

Sood - Direct

805

smarter and get the most bang so everybody can make money. If
you're just giving the guy four grand a month, I just don't
know what you're giving them four grand a month for. You know
what I'm saying?"

When the Dawkins said, "make it smarter and get the most bang," what did you understand that to mean?

- A. That he was really discussing instead of paying a monthly retainer we should pay these coaches based on their potential recruits and how those recruits can work with us.
- Q. Turning to page 17, Mr. Sood. And at line starting at 6

 Mr. Dawkins said, "So like a Book may need these two kids. If

 he may need a grand amount to get something done for you. OK,

 then you give it to them at that point." First of all, who is

 Book again?
 - A. Emanuel Richardson.
- Q. What did you understand Dawkins to be saying with respect to Richardson?
 - A. That, again, if the -- if a coach needs money for a particular recruit, then that's who we should be giving money to.
- Q. So then at page 17, line 13, Mr. Blazer said in response,
 "I might do a little bit of both, though."
- Did you understand what was meant by that?
- A. Yeah. He wanted to pay both, a monthly fee and per opportunity.

Sood - Direct

- Q. Mr. Sood, taking a step back for a moment, what was your understanding of what Mr. Dawkins and Mr. Blazer were debating here?
 - A. Really debating if, again, Marty seemed to be in favor of wanting to pay both a monthly fee to a coach and/or specific players whereas Dawkins -- Christian was saying let's be more strategic and not just pay a monthly retainer to every coach that we decide to work with.
 - Q. Was it your understanding that either Mr. Dawkins or Mr. Blazer were saying that they did not support paying coaches?
- 12 | A. No.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

18

- Q. Finally, Mr. Sood, at page 18, lines 11 through 15 Dawkins said, to the group, "And listen, if -- like a Book, OK, that makes sense to give him four grand a month because he's got the number one pick, he's go -- every year they got a top-ten pick."
 - What did you understand Dawkins to be telling you here?
- A. That he could justify paying Emanuel Richardson four
 thousand because of the caliber of players he has versus Lamont
 Evans who may not.
- Q. Mr. Sood, at the end of this meeting did Mr. D'Angelo provide anything?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 | Q. What was that?
- 2 | A. \$25,000.
- 3 Q. And was that in cash?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. What was your understanding of what that money represented?
- 6 A. That was the initial -- that was his initial contribution
- 7 | to the company.
- 8 Q. Who took the money that day?
- 9 | A. I did.
- 10 | Q. What did you do with the money?
- 11 A. I deposited at a Bank of America branch in New Jersey the
- 12 next day.
- 13 Q. My apologies, Mr. Sood. You may continue. Sorry.
- 14 A. No. I deposited the money the next day in the Bank of
- 15 America branch in New Jersey.
- 16 Q. What bank account did you deposit it into?
- 17 A. Loyd, Inc.
- 18 Q. Mr. Sood, once Loyd, Inc. was founded and a bank account
- 19 set up at Bank of America, did you have access to that account?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. Could you see what transactions were occurring in the
- 22 | account?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. In real time?
- 25 A. Yes.

J4T9DAW2 Sood - Direct THE COURT: Why don't we do this, Mr. Solowiejczyk. Let's take our morning break, fifteen minutes after the hour. Ladies and gentlemen, don't discuss the case. Please be prepared to come back out at 18 after the hour. (Continued on next page)

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sood - Direct

(Jury not present) 2 THE COURT: Mr. Sood, you may step down. Folks can be 3 seated.

(Witness excused)

THE COURT: Anything for me?

MR. HANEY: No, your Honor.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, just to let you know that we're going to probably in the next hour-and-a-half going to get to the call.

THE COURT: I was going to tell you guys come out -you have ten minutes.

(Recess)

(Jury not present)

THE COURT: I see everyone is here. With respect to the letters that were submitted yesterday, the government seeks to preclude that section from Exhibit A to their letter which is the recorded conversation, Government Exhibit 2T that Mr. Code wants to include from pages 5, line 9 to page 6, line 15. With respect to that call between Mr. Sood and Mr. Code I'm going to grant the government's motion to exclude the portion of the call in which Mr. Code recalls a past conversation he had with Mr. Dawkins. I find that Mr. Code's statements do not fall under the state-of-mind exception to hearsay and Rule 803.3. That rule specifically excludes from its scope statements of memory to prove the fact remembered.

Sood - Direct

The statements at issue here plainly fall within this category to my mind. Mr. Code is recalling a past statement that he made and offering the fact that he made the statement for its truth, as recognized in <u>Shepherd v. United States</u>, reported at 290 U.S. 96 and <u>United States v. DiMaria</u>, reported at 727 F.2d 265 statements of memory face backwards, not forward.

I would also grant the government's motion to preclude the portion of the testimony from recorded conversation 104T as requested by Mr. Dawkins, a conversation between himself and Munish Sood in which they discuss their relationship with Mr. D'Angelo. I find that the statements are hearsay and irrelevant.

So that constitutes the judgment of the Court with respect to those two issues.

 $$\operatorname{Mr.}$ Moore, I understand you may have some additional bases that you want to --

MR. MOORE: Yes, sir, your Honor.

First of all, I would respectfully disagree with the Court's ruling but I understand the Court has ruled. I believe that if you read this language carefully it's very clear that he is telling Mr. Sood exactly what he is and he is not willing to do and he is continuing to tell him, as he has told other people, that he does not believe this coach's model works. I believe that it is current as of the time of the making of the statement and is forward-looking.

Sood - Direct

Alternately, your Honor has not addressed the issue of 1 2 whether or not it's admissible under the catch-all exception of 3 the hearsay rule, Rule 807 and -- and I understand that your 4 Honor is making a decision now. Your Honor may revisit that 5 decision subsequent to other evidence that is offered later in the case, correct? 6 7 THE COURT: That's correct. And the government indicated a desire to put in some additional authority with 8 9 respect to the catch-all provision. 10 MR. MOORE: So, as I understand it right now your 11 Honor is not ruling on the catch-all exception issue; is that 12 correct? 13 THE COURT: That's correct. 14 MR. MOORE: Thank you. 15 THE COURT: OK. Are we ready for the jury? Can we 16 bring in Mr. Sood. 17 MR. HANEY: Your Honor, may I briefly also note my 18 catch-all exception as well. 19 THE COURT: Absolutely. 20 MR. HANEY: Thank you, sir. 21 MUNISH SOOD, resumed. 22 (Continued on next page) 23 24 25

J4T9DAW2 Sood - Direct

1 (Jury present)

THE COURT: Mr. Solowiejczyk.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Thank you, your Honor.

- 4 Q. Mr. Sood, where we left off we were talking about taking
- 5 the \$25,000 in cash that day and depositing it.
- 6 A. Yes.

3

- Q. Directing your -- into the Loyd bank account?
- 8 | A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Directing your attention to Government Exhibit 659. Do you
- 10 recognize that document?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 \parallel Q. What is it?
- 13 A. It's a deposit -- it's a receipt from a deposit, the \$25,000 deposit.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, the government offers

 Government Exhibit 659.
- 17 THE COURT: Any objection?
- 18 MR. HANEY: No objection, your Honor.
- 19 MR. MOORE: No objection, your Honor.
- 20 | THE COURT: 659 will be received.
- 21 (Government's Exhibit 659 received in evidence)
- 22 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Publish that briefly, Ms. Bustillo.
- 23 You can take that down.
- 24 | Q. Mr. Sood during the portion of the recording we just
- 25 watched what specific coaches, if any, did Mr. Dawkins propose

- 1 | working with?
- 2 A. Lamont Evans and Emanuel Richardson.
- 3 Q. Did there come a time soon after this meeting when you met
- 4 | with Mr. Richardson in person?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 | Q. Where did that meeting occur?
- 7 A. In Manhattan, New York.
- 8 | Q. Who set up the meeting?
- 9 A. Christian.
- 10 Q. Was Dawkins himself present for the meeting?
- 11 | A. No.
- 12 Q. Mr. Sood, if you could take a look at what's been marked
- 13 for identification as Government Exhibit 1632A.
- 14 A. OK.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: If you could zoom in, Ms. Bustillo,
- 16 | a little bit.
- 17 | Q. Do you recognize this document?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 | Q. What is it?
- 20 | A. It's an e-mail -- sorry, text message exchange between
- 21 | myself and Christian.
- 22 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, the government offers
- 23 Government Exhibit 1632A.
- 24 | THE COURT: Any objection?
- MR. HANEY: No objection, your Honor.

- 1 MR. MOORE: No objection, your Honor.
- THE COURT: 1632A will be received.
- 3 (Government's Exhibit 1632A received in evidence)
- 4 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, if you could just
- 5 publish the top half of this, if you could zoom in on that.
- Q. So, Mr. Sood -- by the way when it says incoming who is that?
- 8 A. That's myself.
- 9 \ Q. When it says outgoing?
- 10 | A. That's Christian.
- 11 | Q. So generally what do these text messages pertain to?
- 12 A. Just the meetings that we were going to be having that day
- 13 or the next day in New York City.
- 14 | Q. And you said these texts are on June 19, right?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. And the meetings occurred the next day?
- 17 \parallel A. Yes. The 20th.
- 18 | Q. Looking at the bottom message, the message from Dawkins,
- 19 what was the schedule of meetings that he proposed?
- 20 | A. 10 a.m. with Emanuel Richardson from Arizona. 1 p.m. with
- 21 | Merl Code. And then 3 p.m. with Preston Murphy of Creighton.
- 22 | Q. You said he was of Creighton. Was he a coach there?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 | Q. Did the meeting with Preston Murphy end up happening that
- 25 | day?

815

1 Α. No.

5

13

- What was your understanding regarding why not? 2 0.
- I believe either he was sick or a family member was sick. 3 Α.
- 4 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Then zooming out, Ms. Bustillo.
 - The bottom few messages of that page you said, "Should I be
- And then Mr. Dawkins responded, "Yes." 6 there?"
- 7 Going to the next page, said, "Make it --
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Zoom in, Ms. Bustillo. 8
- "Make it smoother. You have already met Book. I don't 9 Ο. 10 land until noon in Minnesota today."
- 11 What did you understand Dawkins to mean by "make it 12 smoother"?
 - That since I already met Emanuel Richardson I'd be able to introduce him to Jeff D'Angelo at the meeting.
- 15 Q. Did the meeting that you were discussing take place?
- 16 Α. Yes.
- 17 Can you generally describe what occurred at the meeting?
- 18 Emanuel Richardson just talked about his position at Α.
- 19 University of Arizona, the type of players on the current
- 20 roster and his recruiting, upcoming recruiting, his
- 21 relationship with Christian, and then how we could potentially
- 22 work together.
- 23 And besides you and Mr. Richardson, was Mr. D'Angelo there?
- 24 Α. Yes, he was.
- 25 And this other business partner of his, was she there as

J4T9DAW2 Sood - Direct well? 1 2 Α. Yes. 3 What was her name again? 4 Jill Bailey. Α. 5 Did you bring your assistant again? Yes. She was there. 6 Α. 7 Mr. Sood, what happened at the end of the meeting with Mr. Richardson? 8 A. Jeff D'Angelo gave him an envelope of \$5,000. 9 10 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor at this time the 11 government offers Government Exhibit 509B1, B2, B3, B4, and the associated transcripts 509B1T, B2T, B3T and B4T. 12 13 THE COURT: Any objection? 14 No objection, your Honor. MR. HANEY: 15 MR. MOORE: Can we approach just one moment, your Honor? 16 17 THE COURT: Sure. 18 (Continued on next page) 19 20 21 22

23

24

Sood - Direct

(At sidebar)

MR. MOORE: Your Honor, I'm sure that Mr. Solowiejczyk is going to argue that the statements of Mr. Richardson are admissible as a coconspirator exception to the hearsay rule. I would note that my client is not present for this meeting. My client was not involved in this meeting. My client was not brought in until after this meeting. And so I object under 403 grounds to the admissibility of this conversation against my client.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, a couple of points.

One, the statements between coconspirators in furtherance of the conspiracy, it comes in regardless of whether Mr. Code had or had not joined the conspiracy at that point, which I'm not even going to deal with the merits of right now. But also, importantly, your Honor, there's going to be evidence at this trial that Mr. Code was made aware of specifically what happened at this meeting, specifically that Mr. Richardson got five thousand dollars.

THE COURT: It comes in as a coconspirator statement so the objection will be overruled.

MR. MOORE: And I'll assume your Honor's ruling against me on the 403 argument, because I believe the prejudicial value of this evidence outweighs — the prejudicial nature of this evidence outweighs the probative value as it pertains to my client, Merl Code.

J4T9DAW2 Sood - Direct

THE COURT: I am going to overrule that objection as well. Again, this is just more of the same conversations concerning who was going to get paid what and what coaches could do, etc.

MR. MOORE: Thank you, your Honor.

(Continued on next page)

J4T9DAW2 Sood - Direct

1 (In open court)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

THE COURT: Those exhibits will be received.

3 (Government's Exhibits 509B1, B2, B3, B4, 509B1T, B2T,

B3T and B4T received in evidence)

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, if we could play 509B1 starting at page 1, line 1.

This is a June 20 meeting between Jeff D'Angelo, Jill Bailey, Munish Sood, and Book Richardson. And I will just note that to the extent that the transcript cover page says that Christian Dawkins is there, that is incorrect. We would request the jury disregard that.

THE COURT: Very well.

(Video played)

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Pause for a second, Ms. Bustillo.

- Q. So, Mr. Sood, it's a little -- it's blurred out but where was Mr. Richardson seated during the meeting?
- A. He was against the wall over there, I guess the wood,

whatever that is, the wooden, right there. Yes.

- Q. And where -- there's a -- to his left or I guess to his right there is somebody. Who is that?
- 21 A. That's Alicia Carroll.
- 22 | Q. Where were you seated, do you remember?
- 23 A. To the left of her.
- 24 | Q. And then the two people to the right of Ms. Carroll?
- 25 A. That's Jill Bailey and Jeff D'Angelo.

25

1 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Thanks, Ms. Bustillo. 2 (Video played) MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Pause here, Ms. Bustillo. 3 4 Mr. Sood, just going back to page 2 of the transcript for a 5 moment. And lines specifically starting at line 5. You said, "But the goal is to get you to a place where you're comfortable 6 7 with us like you are with Christian and how we can help you continue to recruit." 8 9 What did you mean by that, Mr. Sood? 10 That he should be -- he should get to a point where he can 11 ask us directly if he needs help with money for recruiting. MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, you can continue and 12 13 I believe we left off at page 4, line 2, approximately of the 14 transcript. 15 (Video played) Q. Mr. Sood, turning back to page 6, starting at line 23, you 16 17 said to Mr. Richardson, "So you will help guide us both from an economic perspective what you need and how you need it." 18 What did you mean by that, Mr. Sood? 19 20 That Emanuel Richardson will -- should let us know how much 21 money he needs and when. 22 Q. What was your sense at that time whether Mr. Richardson was 23 receptive to what you were proposing? 24 Α. I believed he was open to it.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, I think we're picking

- 1 | up at page 7, around line 8 or 9.
- 2 (Video played)
- 3 Q. Mr. Sood just going back to page 8 of the transcript,
- 4 | there's a discussion here of somebody named DeAndre Ayton
- 5 starting at page 8, around line 20.
- 6 | A. Yes.

- Q. Who did you understand him to be at that time?
- 8 A. A -- potentially a number one draft pick.
- 9 Q. What school was he going to be playing basketball at?
- 10 A. University of Arizona.
- 11 Q. Mr. Sood, do you know if Mr. Ayton ended up being a number
- 12 one draft pick?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. Page 8, starting at line 21.
- Mr. Richardson said to you: It's not about well hey
- 16 we're going to be one of three, excuse my expression, F that,
- 17 DeAndre, this is what you're doing.
- 18 What did you understand Richardson to be saying here?
- 19 A. That instead of referring three agents to DeAndre he would
- 20 refer just one.
- 21 Q. And who was that going to be going forward?
- 22 | A. Should be us if we're helping him with money.
- 23 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: I think we were around the bottom
- 24 of page 9, Ms. Bustillo.
- 25 (Video played)

Sood - Direct

- 1 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: All right. Ms. Bustillo, if we 2 could back to page 11.
- 3 Q. So, Mr. Sood, at lines 19 through 23 of page 11,
- 4 Mr. Richardson said to you and the group, "The goal is like,
- 5 again, and like I told Christian, get on campus. He's getting
- 6 Rawle Alkins. I'm telling you, he's getting Rawle Alkins.
- 7 | There's, like, no ifs, ands about that."
- 8 Mr. Sood, what was your understanding who Rawle Alkins 9 was?
- 10 A. A player with Arizona.
- 11 Q. Is he on the Arizona team?
- 12 A. Yes.

17

- Q. What did you understand Mr. Richardson to be saying with respect to Rawle Alkins?
- 15 A. That if Christian shows up on campus, he'll make the
 16 introduction, and pretty much guarantees that he'll be a client
- Q. At page 12, at line 10, Mr. Sood, Emanuel Richardson said,
- 19 "I'm trying to take the risk out of the room." Did you
- 20 understand what that meant?

of the firm.

- 21 A. That if he's referring us as -- as the management company
- 22 | for the player, he could -- he can control the environment by
- 23 keeping other agents and advisers away.
- 24 | Q. Then finally, Mr. Sood, at page 14, there was a mention of
- 25 | a player named Jahvon Quinerly. What was Richardson saying

- 1 | about his status at that time?
 - A. That he was considered top, top player in the country.
 - Q. Was that a player he was trying to recruit at that time?
 - A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: All right. So we're going to flip a couple pages ahead to page 18, line 18. Ms. Bustillo, if you could play that clip, please.

(Video played)

- Q. Going back, Mr. Sood, at page 18 and focusing your attention on the part starting at line 18, there's a discussion here about Jahvon Quinerly, Mr. Sood, is that correct?
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. When Mr. Richardson said, "So, you know, I'm dealing with a quy who says, hey, Book, it's 20 to get it done, and I'm like,
- F, OK," what did you understand Mr. Richardson to be telling you there?
- A. That a handler for Quinerly was looking for 20,000 to get him to commit to University of Arizona.
 - MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: All right. Ms. Bustillo, if we could skip ahead to page 23, line 1, of the transcript and the associated recording.

(Video played)

- Q. Mr. Sood, generally, during that portion of the conversation, what was Mr. Richardson recounting for you?
 - A. That he was using his personal money to help fund his

- 1 recruits.
- Q. What, if anything, did he say about what Christian Dawkins
- 3 | had told him about that?
- 4 A. Christian had suggested using someone else, outside of using his own money.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: OK. We're now going to move on to 509B2, and we're not going to go through the entirety of the exhibit. We're just going to play a few excerpts of it.
- 9 Ms. Bustillo, if we could go to page 2, line 10, of 10 509B2.
- 11 (Video played)
- Q. Mr. Sood, what specific player was Mr. Richardson talking about during this portion of the meeting?
- 14 A. Rawle Alkins.
- Q. Richardson referenced somebody's cousin. Who did you understand that to be?
- 17 | A. Rawle's cousin.
- Q. What was your understanding regarding what Mr. Richardson was telling you about the situation with the cousin?
- 20 A. That in order to get Rawle Alkins to commit to Arizona, his cousin had moved out, and he would have to fund him about -- he
- 22 | had to fund him \$2,000 a month.
- 23 | Q. Looking at page 4, Mr. Sood, lines 1 to 4, when
- 24 Mr. Richardson said, "If anything happens, it's their word
- 25 against mine. And when it's cash, you know, I don't know what

Sood - Direct

- they're talking about," did you understand what he meant by that?
 - A. Yes.

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

20

- Q. What did you understand that to mean?
- 5 A. That he shouldn't be paying these players and cash was not traceable.
 - Q. What was your understanding at that time about what, if anything, could occur if these payments were discovered?
 - A. He could be fired, Emanuel Richardson.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, if we could pick up at page 5, line 24, of the transcript.

(Video played)

- Q. Mr. Sood, what was Mr. D'Angelo generally proposing to
 Mr. Richardson, if anything, during that portion of the
 recording?
- A. That D'Angelo would allocate a sum of money for him, and then it's up to Emanuel Richardson to tell us if he'd want monthly or he wants for specific recruits or both.
- 19 Q. What was Mr. Richardson's response to that idea?
 - A. He was -- he was interested. He was open.
- Q. What, if anything, did Richardson offer with respect to making introductions to players?
- 23 A. He would do that.
- Q. At the end when he said, "As soon as they commit, it's a phone call, or if I can't, can you guys FaceTime," did you

- 1 understand what he meant by that?
- 2 A. That once the player was committed to the University of
- 3 Arizona, he would set up an initial meeting by phone call or
- 4 FaceTime.

5

- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, moving on Government Exhibit 509B3.
- 7 (Video played)
- 8 Q. Mr. Sood, turning to lines 5 through 8, when Mr. Richardson
- 9 | said, "When I'm there, they're always going to defer to me. If
- 10 | a question is asked, they're going to look at me, and I'm like,
- 11 | that's what they know, " what did you understand him to mean by
- 12 | that?
- 13 A. That based on the relationship, he can direct players to
- 14 someone like us.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Finally, turning to 509B4.
- 16 | (Video played)
- 17 | Q. Mr. Sood, going back to the beginning of that call, at
- 18 page 1, what was Mr. Richardson saying, if anything, regarding
- 19 the nature of his relationship with Rawle Alkins?
- 20 A. That it was strong.
- 21 | Q. Looking at page 2, line 23, when Mr. D'Angelo said, "We'll
- 22 do five now, and then, like you said, it's, you know, do what
- 23 you got to do," what did you understand Mr. D'Angelo to mean by
- 24 | "we'll do five now"?
- 25 $\mid A$. That he was going to give him \$5,000.

827

J4THDaw3

- Sood Direct
- And what did you see occur after that? 1
- 2 That he did give him \$5,000 in an envelope. Α.
 - MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, if we could turn ahead to page 11, line 6.

(Video played)

- Q. Mr. Sood, turning back to page 11, at line 7, you said, 6
- 7 "And, you know, everything we talk about stays here, so we're
- very, very private about this stuff," what did you mean by 8
- that? 9

3

4

- 10 That he should not be accepting money for us; otherwise, he
- 11 will get fired. He will be fired.
- 12 Q. Why were you telling him you were going to be private about
- 13 stuff?
- A. Well, we shouldn't be giving and he shouldn't be passing it 14
- 15 on to the players as well.
- What was Richardson's response to that? 16 0.
- 17 A. He said he trusted us.
- 18 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: All right. Ms. Bustillo, you can
- take that down. 19
- 20 Q. Now, Mr. Sood, after your meeting with Mr. Richardson that
- 21 day on June 20, did you have a second meeting that day?
- 22 Α. Yes.
- 23 Who was that with? 0.
- 24 Α. Merl Code.
- 25 Whose idea was it to meet with Merl Code?

- 1 A. Christian Dawkins.
- 2 | Q. Had you ever heard of Merl Code before that?
- 3 | A. No.
- 4 Q. What did Dawkins tell you about Merl Code in advance of the
- 5 | meeting?
- 6 \parallel A. That Merl was a -- was at Adidas in the shoe business. He
- 7 | had relationships with coaches and players from the high school
- 8 | level to the pro level.
- 9 Q. What, if anything, did Dawkins tell you about how Code
- 10 | might be helpful to the new business that you were starting?
- 11 A. He could make introductions to both coaches and players.
- 12 | Q. Generally speaking, what did you understand the purpose of
- meeting with Merl Code was that day?
- 14 A. To get to know him and also determine if we can work
- 15 | together.
- 16 | Q. Mr. Sood, at the time of that meeting, did you know it was
- 17 | being video recorded?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. Did you review a copy of the recording before testifying?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, this recording's
- 22 | already in evidence. We're going to play a couple of excerpts
- 23 | from it.
- 24 THE COURT: What's the recording?
- 25 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: This is Government Exhibit 510A1 --

Case 1:17-cr-00684-ER Document 262 Filed 06/05/19 Page 87 of 171 J4THDaw3 Sood - Direct sorry, yes, 510A1. This is a June 20 meeting between Munish Sood, Merl Code, Marty Blazer, Jill Bailey, Christian Dawkins, Jeff D'Angelo, and Alicia Carroll. And we're going to start at page 1, line 1, of Government Exhibit 510A1T. (Video played) Q. Mr. Sood, Mr. D'Angelo said, "I'm pretty sure he left happy, so..." and then Mr. Code responded, "He was happy." What did you understand that to mean? MR. MOORE: Your Honor, could we approach for a moment, please? THE COURT: Yes. (Continued on next page)

J4THDaw3

(At sidebar)

MR. MOORE: Your Honor, I'm going to object to
Mr. Sood interpreting what my client meant. This is the first
time he's ever met my client. I don't believe that the
government has laid a sufficient foundation for his
interpretation. In addition, I would renew my earlier
objection with respect to the playing of this video because the
agent's comments -- the agent's statement, "He was happy," the
government is truly offering that as substantive evidence.
They are not offering it to simply put Mr. Code's statements
into context. That is an observation about an alleged
coconspirator.

So for those reasons, I renew my objection to this video, and I also object to elicitation of any information from Mr. Sood about the interpretation of what Mr. Code meant.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, with respect to the latter argument, in order to put in context the statement by Code, "he was happy," we needed the prior statement by D'Angelo, "I'm pretty sure he left happy." So I think that deals with that arguments.

With respect to Mr. Sood's ability to interpret what
Mr. Code is saying, I think your Honor's already ruled on this.
He was a participant in the conversation, he has an
understanding of what's going on, and he proceeds from this
point forward to have an ongoing relationship with Merl Code in

J4THDaw3 Sood - Direct

which they speak relatively frequently and understand each other.

THE COURT: We've gone over all of this before. Even if he's meeting for the first time and they're having a conversation, he would be entitled to say what he believed the other person meant to say. So the objection is overruled, and the renewed objection to the prior ruling is also overruled.

MR. MOORE: I'm assume on cross-examination I'm free to explore his relationship with Mr. Code prior to coming into this meeting, correct?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. MOORE: Thank you.

(Continued on next page)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

- - Q. Mr. Sood, I think I had asked you, Mr. D'Angelo said, "I'm pretty sure he left happy, so..." and then Mr. Code responded, "He was happy." What did you understand that exchange to be referring to?
 - A. That Emanuel Richardson -- Jeff D'Angelo had given Emanuel Richardson \$5,000 and that Code was aware of it and he agreed.
 - Q. Now, Mr. Sood, what, if anything, did you learn during this meeting about the nature of the relationship between Merl Code and Emanuel Richardson?
- 12 A. That they had a preexisting relationship.
- Q. During the meeting, what did Mr. Code tell you, if anything, about his prior work experience?
 - A. That he had worked before at Adidas. He was at Nike, and University of Arizona is a Nike school.
 - Q. What, if anything, did Code tell you about his relationships with coaches at Nike-sponsored programs?
 - A. That he still maintained them.
- Q. Mr. Sood, based on the conversation that happened that day, how, if at all, did you believe that Mr. Code might be helpful to the business that you were starting with Christian Dawkins and Jeff D'Angelo?
- MR. MOORE: Objection. Relevance.
- 25 THE COURT: Overruled.

- A. That he would be able to introduce us to coaches and also players.
- Q. Now, at that time, Mr. Sood, what was your understanding regarding what, if anything, Mr. Code was going to receive in
- 5 exchange for his assistance?
- 6 A. He was going to receive a retainer, a monthly fee.
- Q. Had you spoken to Christian Dawkins previously about this before the meeting?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- Q. Mr. Sood, during this meeting, what was discussed, if anything, regarding how your company was going to be working with college basketball coaches going forward?
- 13 A. That the company would be providing coaches with money so
 14 the coaches can recruit and eventually give us access to those
 15 players.
- 16 Q. Did Merl Code participate in those discussions, Mr. Sood?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- Q. All right. I want to review a couple of excerpts of this recording with you, Mr. Sood.
- If we could go to 510A3T, and we're going to pick

 up -- we're going to pick up at page 2, line 24, of this

 transcript.
- Let's give the jury a minute to get there,

 Ms. Bustillo. All right. Ms. Bustillo, please play when

 you're ready. We're starting at page 2, I believe. Yes.

1 (Video played)

- 2 BY MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK:
- 3 Q. Mr. Sood, going back up to line 5, when Mr. Code said, "I
- 4 | need to be visible and present, right, and if the kid is that
- 5 | important, I need to be there. I need to fight off somebody
- 6 because the out of sight, out of mind is really in play here,"
- 7 | what did you understand Mr. Code to be saying?
- 8 A. That he needed to have a presence on campus.
- 9 Q. For what purpose?
- 10 A. To -- to remind the player that, you know, he's been
- 11 | helping or he's part of the team.
- 12 | Q. Going a little further down at line 19, when Mr. Code said,
- 13 | "And so if I'm not -- if I'm not there, we don't have a
- 14 presence there in some sense, I'm going to lose the kid," did
- 15 | you understand what he meant by "a presence there in some
- 16 sense"?
- 17 A. To have either a family member or a coach that's looking
- 18 | out.
- 19 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: If we could go to 510B3T,
- 20 Ms. Bustillo.
- 21 (Video played)
- 22 | Q. Mr. Sood, going back to page 1 of the transcript, at
- 23 | line 4, Mr. Dawkins said, "And then we can activate them as it
- 24 comes, because it could be -- like I told you, everybody
- 25 doesn't need to be a retainer-type, monthly-type deal." What

- 1 | did you understand Mr. Dawkins to be referring to here?
- 2 A. That money could be provided for a specific player that a coach may be looking to recruit.
- Q. When he mentioned a monthly type or retainer type monthly deal, did you understand what that meant?
 - A. Versus just paying someone, say, \$3,000 a month.
 - Q. When you say "someone," who do you mean?
- 8 A. I mean coach.

6

7

9

10

16

17

18

- Q. Going a little further down, at line 19, Mr. Code said, "That's our value to you guys," and then he went on to say,
- "You aren't just randomly spending money." Did you understand what he meant by that?
- 13 A. That he could help identify which will be the best option 14 for us, monthly versus specific opportunity with a coach.
- 15 Q. If you could take a look at Government Exhibit 510B5T.
 - Ms. Bustillo, I think we're picking up at page 1, line 1, of that transcript.

(Video played)

- Q. Mr. Sood, just going back to page 3 at line 19, when

 Mr. Code said, "And they understand, because they're going to

 use those moneys not necessarily to put in their pockets.
- They're going to use those moneys to recruit kids," what did you understand Mr. Code to be saying?
- 24 A. It's the coaches.
- 25 Q. What about them?

- 1 A. That they'll be using the money for recruiting.
- 2 | Q. At page 4 when Mr. Code said, at line 4, "They typically
- 3 come out of their own pockets," and then "to take care of
- 4 | rent, " what did you understand that to mean?
- 5 A. That coaches from -- coaches, if they didn't have access to
- 6 money, would be using their personal funds for recruiting
- 7 purposes.
- 8 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: All right. If we could just turn
- 9 ahead a little bit to page 6, line 25.
- 10 (Video played)
- 11 | Q. All right. Mr. Sood, at page 7 when Mr. Code said, this is
- 12 | line 5, "So the coach route is great, but not necessarily. We
- don't necessarily need to be paying everybody, every coach we
- 14 come into contact with, and we'll figure out who those people
- 15 | are," what did you understand him to mean?
- 16 A. That we should be strategic in the coaches that we are
- 17 working with.
- 18 | Q. When you say "working with," what do you mean, Mr. Sood?
- 19 A. In providing money for recruiting.
- 20 \ Q. Mr. Sood, at the end of that meeting, what, if anything,
- 21 | did you observe Jeff D'Angelo provide to Merl Code?
- 22 A. Envelope with money.
- 23 Q. Mr. Sood, after the meeting that day, do you recall where
- 24 you went?
- 25 A. To the bank.

- 1 | Q. Why'd you go to the bank?
- 2 A. Made a deposit in the Loyd Management account.
- 3 Q. Now, what was your understanding of what that money was
- 4 for?
- 5 A. For the company to use for recruiting and expenses.
- 6 Q. Did you make that deposit -- at which branch was it at?
- 7 A. It was in Manhattan.
- 8 Q. After that, where did you go?
- 9 A. Back to New Jersey.
- 10 Q. Now, Mr. Sood, after this meeting on June 20 with Emanuel
- 11 Richardson that we went over a few minutes ago, did there come
- 12 | a point where you learned that Emanuel Richardson was seeking
- more money from your new company?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. How did you first learn about that?
- 16 A. From Christian.
- 17 | Q. How did he tell you that?
- 18 A. By phone call.
- 19 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, at this time the
- 20 government would offer Government Exhibit 142 and the
- 21 corresponding transcript, 142T.
- 22 THE COURT: Any objection?
- MR. HANEY: No objection, your Honor.
- MR. MOORE: 403, your Honor.
- 25 THE COURT: Overruled on that basis. 142 and 142T

1 | will be received.

(Government's Exhibits 142 and 142T received in evidence)

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: So this is a July 7, 2017, call between Christian Dawkins and Munish Sood at 10:36 a.m. It's Government Exhibit 142T. Seems like it may not be in the binders, but it's also going to be on the screen as well.

(Audio played)

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, can I just have one moment?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: My apologies, your Honor, we're just getting a hard copy of one of the transcripts because it was missing from the binder.

- Q. All right. Mr. Sood, I want to go back to -- well, first of all, what were you generally discussing with Mr. Dawkins during this portion of the phone call we listened to?
- A. Christian had requested \$15,000 from Jeff, and it seems like Jeff really hasn't -- hadn't agreed to fund the 15,000 for Emanuel Richardson.
 - Q. So looking at page 5, line 6, when Dawkins said, "I got to talk to him about this shit with Book, because Book needs to get some money up front to try to get this shit done for the recruit," what did you understand Mr. Dawkins to be saying?
- A. That Emanuel Richardson had requested \$15,000 for a

839

J4THDaw3

1

particular recruit.

- 2 When Dawkins said that Book needs to get the money -- to get some money up front, what did you understand that to mean? 3
- Like he needed it right now. 4 Α.
- 5 Q. Looking at page 5, lines 10 through 13, when Mr. Dawkins
- said, "If Jeff doesn't say yes to this, I'm just gonna be like, 6
- 7 well, Jeff, your whole idea of everything is retarded. Like,
- it doesn't make sense," based on what Mr. Dawkins was saying, 8
- what was your understanding regarding whether he did or did not 9
- 10 support making the \$15,000 payment?
- 11 A. At that time it seems like Jeff hadn't agreed yet to
- 12 provide the 15.
- 13 Q. Mr. Sood, during this conversation, what was your own view
- 14 about whether Jeff should or should not provide the 15,000?
- 15 I thought it made sense because it was for a particular
- 16 recruit.
- 17 Why was the fact it was for a particular recruit relevant
- to you? 18
- Because then it's more likely that we'll be -- we'll have 19
- 20 access to the player if he gets to the pro level.
- 21 Who was going to give you that access? Q.
- 22 Emanuel Richardson, the coach.
- 23 Mr. Sood, prior to this occasion, had there been other
- 24 occasions when Jeff D'Angelo had provided payments to coaches
- where it made less sense to you? 25

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 Q. When was that?
- 3 A. For example, when he paid Emanuel Richardson 5,000 in the
- 4 meeting in New York.
- 5 | Q. Was that the meeting we reviewed a couple minutes ago?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 | Q. Mr. Sood, before that meeting, did you know that
- 8 Mr. D'Angelo was planning to pay Mr. Richardson?
- 9 | A. No.
- 10 Q. Mr. Sood, why did that payment of \$5,000 not make sense to
- 11 | you?
- 12 | A. Because I had no idea what the purpose of the money was.
- 13 Q. What do you mean by "purpose"?
- 14 A. Meaning what was it going to be used for, what which player
- 15 or something else?
- 16 | Q. Right after that meeting, did you have a conversation with
- 17 Mr. Dawkins?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 Q. This is the June 20 meeting in New York, right?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: At this time, your Honor, the
- 22 government would offer Government Exhibit 104 and 104T.
- THE COURT: Any objection?
- MR. MOORE: No objection.
- MR. HANEY: No objection, your Honor. Thank you.

J4THDaw3 Sood - Direct

THE COURT: 104 and 104T will be received.

(Government's Exhibits 104 and 104T received in evidence)

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Can we have one moment, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, if we could make a brief request. It he appears one of the binders is missing the transcripts, but that the other jurors, the jurors who have screens, some of them have them in their binders — or they don't, no.

OK. All right. Then we're just going to have to do it on the screens, and for the jurors that don't have them in their binders, we'll provide a hard copy.

THE COURT: Very well. Everyone has access to a screen, right?

JUROR: Yes.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: The ones at the end, it's hard for them to see, so I'm going to be giving them a hard copy, if that's OK with your Honor.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, when you're ready, if we could play an excerpt of this recording.

(Audio played)

BY MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK:

Q. So, Mr. Sood, is this call directly after the meeting that

- 1 | you had with Book Richardson in New York City on June 20?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 | Q. Generally, what were you discussing with Mr. Dawkins during
- 4 | the call?
- 5 A. Just the fact that Emanuel Richardson received \$5,000, and
- 6 Jeff D'Angelo was very happy that he took the money.
- 7 Q. Mr. Sood, would it be fair to say that you and Mr. Dawkins
- 8 were making fun of Jeff D'Angelo a little bit during this call?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. Why were you making fun of him?
- 11 A. Because he -- he gave him \$5,000, and I wasn't sure why he
- 12 gave the money to him.
- 13 | Q. Looking at page 1, line 18, when you said -- sorry,
- 14 | line 17, when you said, "Jeff is like F'ing high," what did you
- 15 | mean by that?
- 16 | A. That he was able to give Emanuel Richardson money, and
- 17 | Emanuel Richardson took the money.
- 18 | Q. Looking at page 2, lines 9 through 11 -- sorry, 8 through
- 19 | 10, I should say, when you said, "You know, he's like F'ing
- 20 | dying, man. He's dying. Don't wake him up, " what did you mean
- 21 | by that, Mr. Sood?
- 22 | A. That if he wants to keep funding coaches, then let him.
- 23 | Q. At the time, Mr. Sood, what benefit did you see, if any,
- 24 | from Jeff D'Angelo providing money to coaches for yourself?
- 25 A. Coaches be able to recruit and then, in return, give us

- 1 access to the players.
- 2 | Q. Now, Mr. Sood, taking a step back, prior to this we just
- 3 | listened to a call from July 7 with Dawkins regarding an
- 4 | additional \$15,000 that Richardson was asking for from you?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Were you supportive or not supportive of making that
- 7 payment?
- 8 A. I was OK with that payment.
- 9 Q. Why were you OK with that payment?
- 10 | A. Because that's for a specific recruit.
- 11 | Q. What was the difference, in your mind, between the \$5,000
- 12 | payment on June 20 and the later \$15,000 payment?
- 13 A. The 5,000, I didn't think had any purpose. I didn't -- I
- 14 | needed clarity what the money was for; whereas 15 was for a
- 15 | specific recruit.
- 16 Q. What was your understanding that if -- if Mr. Richardson
- 17 | got that recruit to Arizona, what was your understanding how
- 18 | that could benefit you and your new company, if at all?
- 19 | A. It would give us access to that player and manage the
- 20 relationship.
- 21 | Q. Mr. Sood, did you have an additional discussion with
- 22 Mr. Dawkins on the same day, July 7, 2017?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- Q. When I say "same day," I mean the day of the prior phone
- 25 | call we listened to regarding the \$15,000 ask.

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. Was that also by phone?
3	A. Yes.
4	MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, at this time the
5	government would offer Government Exhibit 144 and 144T.
6	THE COURT: Any objection?
7	MR. HANEY: No objection, your Honor. Thank you.
8	THE COURT: 144 and 144T will be received.
9	(Government's Exhibits 144 and 144T received in
10	evidence)
11	MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: I think many of the exhibits I'm
12	going to refer to are not in the jurors' binders, but they will
13	be on the screen, just so they know.
14	THE COURT: Very well.
15	MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Sorry, your Honor, we offer this.
16	THE COURT: I think it was already.
17	MR. HANEY: No objection.
18	THE COURT: 144 will be received.
19	MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: This is a July 7, 2017, call at
20	10:52 a.m. between Christian Dawkins and Munish Sood. It's
21	Government Exhibit 144, and going to pick up at page 1, line 1.
22	(Audio played)
23	THE COURT: OK. Folks, it's 12:45, so we're going to
24	take our second break. Please be prepared to come back out at
0.5	

1 o'clock. Do not discuss the case. (Jury excused)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sood - Direct

1 (Jury not present) 2 THE COURT: You folks can be seated. 3 Mr. Sood, you can step down. 4 Anything either side wants to raise? 5 MR. MOORE: Just very briefly, your Honor. I thought 6 we had an agreement with the government that words like 7 "retarded" were coming out of these calls and transcripts. had that discussion in Gatto. I thought we had that discussion 8 9 here, and I've seen that word repeated many times today. 10 thought we had an agreement with the government that they were 11 going to delete those words from the calls and from the 12 transcripts. 13 Second, to your Honor's earlier point about the rule 14

Second, to your Honor's earlier point about the rule of completeness, I would simply — and I know that your Honor did not rest your ruling on the rule of completeness earlier, but I would respectfully cite to the Court two cases. One is United States v. Sutton, which is a DC circuit case found at 801 F.2d 1346, and the second case is a Second Circuit case which adopts the reasoning of the DC circuit case. That case is United States v. Johnson, 507 F.3d 793, 796. It's a Second Circuit case from 2007. Both of those cases hold that if a — if the content of a recording, a writing, a document, ought to in fairness be introduced, then the Court needs to go no further. And just because something is inadmissible hearsay does not mean that it should not be introduced into evidence

if, in fairness, it ought to be included.

I simply bring those two cases to the Court's attention. I decided to take a quick look and found those. I will be -- I will tell the Court, candidly, I've not KeyCited them. I've not looked for other Second Circuit cases because I'm doing this a bit on the fly.

MR. HANEY: Your Honor, to that point, now that the Court has heard the call that was referenced early, 104 and 104T, I would submit that now the Court has a better understanding of the context, and you can hear what these two gentlemen are talking about. They're laughing at Jeff D'Angelo. They're laughing at the payment being made to the coach. Munish Sood testified that he only wants to get veteran players in the NBA. He's not talking about Book Richardson sending student athletes from the University of Arizona to the financial planning arm of Loyd Management. He's doing something or wanting to do something that is completely lawful, which is go get players that are veterans that Book Richardson may have coached when he was an AAU coach or collegiate coach.

For him to later in that same conversation say, let's get Jeff back and stroke him off a little more, I think, as Mr. Moore has noted, it would violate the rule of completeness. That particular statement of let's get him back and stroke him off a little more, like we just did earlier, I think should be heard by the jury, your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sood - Direct

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, what Mr. Haney said that's what Mr. Sood testified. There's some discussion in the recording about veterans. That's not what he testified to just now. He testified about the distinction between the \$5,000 payment and the later \$15,000.

Regarding what Mr. Moore has said to say, we've definitely gone back and forth on lots of recordings. Mr. Haney asked me to take some stuff out. Over the weekend we did. The statement "If Jeff doesn't pay this money, that's retarded," it's an incredibly important statement. If you take out the word "retarded," it won't have any meaning. Frankly, it's a very important piece of evidence. I don't think there's was anything untoward about including that statement. And the defense counsel have had these recordings for a long time. So if they had a specific issue with it, they should have taken it up at that time.

THE COURT: I take it the concern is that the jury will hold it against Mr. Dawkins for using that word.

MR. MOORE: Yes, sir. And then also hold it against Mr. Code because they're friends. Mr. Dawkins, unfortunately, I'm familiar with a lot of recordings, uses that word much more frequently than I wish he did.

THE COURT: Again, if there was an agreement between the parties concerning that language, I was not made aware of that agreement. I don't know that there's anything to be done

now about it. I don't know whether it's going to be used in future transcripts.

Sood - Direct

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: It does come up again in some recordings, your Honor.

MR. HANEY: Your Honor, we've had conversations for more than a few months. We've been talking about this back in the Gatto trial when there were transcripts and references that my client was using language that would be potentially prejudicial to the jury, and I believe we've worked to try to redact as much as we can. However, we are getting rolling transcripts, your Honor, at like midnight, right?

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: That's not true, your Honor.

MR. HANEY: That is true, your Honor. We are getting information, and I'm sure counsel can verify this. We got a letter motion last night at 11:30 in the evening. I had to respond at midnight. So this is putting us in a very difficult position being from out of jurisdiction, in hotel rooms responding to motions that they're filing at midnight, your Honor. So if a word slips through the cracks, I would ask that they exercise their duties and obligations I think they owe as officers of the court to honor the agreement that we had and not to intentionally project what they know is going to be inflammatory and prejudicial references in transcripts to the jury.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, we've provided all

Sood - Direct

these transcripts quite some time ago, and I think we've -because we expected defense counsel to try to make arguments
like this, we keep pretty good track of when we provided
things. They've had this transcript for a long time.

The statement, "If Jeff doesn't provide this money, that's retarded," look, that's the word Mr. Dawkins used. And, frankly, if you took out the word "retarded," you wouldn't understand what he was saying. Sometimes there's important pieces of evidence that have some language — to be clear, your Honor, these transcripts are full of curse words and other offensive statements. We've tried our best to keep things out. To give you an example, Mr. Haney was very adamant with us. There was a reference to somebody having Tourette syndrome and Mr. Dawkins mocking that person. We took it out because we didn't think it was relevant.

So we're trying to be fair and reasonable. We're giving the defense a list of exhibits we plan to offer the next day. So if they have an issue, I'm not sure why they're now raising it here.

THE COURT: Like I said, this issue's being brought to my attention for the first time now. If there are particular items that the parties don't agree on and you want me to rule on, then bring them to my attention.

Mr. Haney, I'm in the same position as you are. I'm receiving documents and motions at midnight and having to deal

J4THDaw3 Sood - Direct

with them at 9 o'clock in the morning. That's just the way trials go. My working assumption is that these issues are being addressed as they come up and not that anyone on either side is trying to sandbag the other.

MR. HANEY: Fair enough, your Honor. However, I do want to note I've been trying to personally work these issues out for three weeks, your Honor, or longer. We don't need to address them at midnight the day before court. I don't think that's appropriate.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. 1 o'clock, don't be late.

(Recess)

```
J4T9DAW4
                                 Sood - Direct
                THE COURT: Could we get Mr. Sood back in, please.
 1
 2
                MUNISH SOOD, resumed.
 3
                (Continued on next page)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 (Jury present)

THE COURT: Mr. Solowiejczyk.

3 BY MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK:

4

5

6

7

8

- Q. I believe, Mr. Sood, we were talking about a July 7, 2017 phonecall between you and Christian Dawkins.
- Government Exhibit 144. So, at page 1, Mr. Sood, what concerns, if any, did you understand Mr. Dawkins to have regarding D'Angelo at that time?
- 9 A. That Jeff D'Angelo's ability to relate to these players.
- Q. And what was your understanding of whether D'Angelo had asked to meet with some of the players?
- 12 A. Yes. D'Angelo had asked in particular to meet with the 13 players connected to Emanuel Richardson.
- 14 | Q. What was Dawkins' view of this?
- 15 | A. It didn't make sense.
- 16 Q. If you could turn to page 4, specifically line 22.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, I'm not going to use the recording.
- Q. So page 4, line 22, you said, Mr. Sood "The process is you give -- we're gonna give Book some money. Book is gonna do his shit. When the kid is solidly part of our team, committed, that's when guys like me and Jeff will meet him."
- What did you mean by that, Mr. Sood?
- A. Just the process. Give Book, Emanuel Richardson, the money

 he needs to recruit. Once that's completed and if the -- if

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Sood - Direct

- and when the player commits to us, then introduce Jeff and
 myself to the player and/or family.
 - Q. So, looking at page 5, Mr. Sood, lines 18 to 20. You said, "Because I want you to get this kid, and I wanna sign the big kid if we need that 25, 50,000 later too."

Who were you referring to here, Mr. Sood?

- A. DeAndre Ayton.
- Q. What, if anything, did you understand regarding how providing this money to Richardson could assist in getting DeAndre Ayton as a client?
- 11 A. It could put us in a position, since we provided the funds
 12 to Emanuel Richardson, it would position us to have access to
 13 the player.
- Q. To be clear, this \$15,000 that he was asking for, it was for a different player?
- 16 A. Oh, yes. Sorry. I thought you meant 25.
- Q. All right. So turning to -- Mr. Sood, after you had these conversations with Mr. Dawkins did you talk to Mr. D'Angelo about the \$15,000 payment to Richardson as well?
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. And after these discussions did Mr. D'Angelo ultimately agree to provide the \$15,000 to Richardson?
- 23 | A. He did.
- 24 | Q. And was Mr. Dawkins a party to those discussions as well?
- 25 A. Yes.

J4T9DAW4

- Q. Now, did Mr. D'Angelo provide the money to Richardson by wire or by check?
- 3 | A. No.
- 4 | Q. How was it provided?
- 5 A. Emanuel Richardson was traveling and he ended up being in
- 6 New Jersey so he came to my office and met with myself and Jeff
- 7 D'Angelo.
- 8 | Q. And was the \$15,000 provided to him at that time?
- 9 | A. It was.
- 10 | Q. In what form?
- 11 | A. Cash.
- 12 | Q. Mr. Sood, which recruit was this -- what was your
- 13 understanding of which recruit this \$15,000 was going to help
- 14 | secure for Richardson?
- 15 A. Jahvon Quinerly.
- 16 | Q. Prior to -- did you know the meeting at your office was
- 17 | being recorded, Mr. Sood?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 | Q. Prior to testifying, did you review a recording of that
- 20 | meeting?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. And who was present?
- 23 A. Myself, Jeff D'Angelo, and Emanuel Richardson.
- 24 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, at this time the
- government would offer Government Exhibits 511B1, 511B2, 511B5,

- J4T9DAW4 Sood - Direct 511B6, 511B7 and the associated transcripts 511B1T, 511B2T, 1 2 511B5T, 511B6T and 511B7T. MR. HANEY: No objection. 3 Thank you. MR. MOORE: 4 Same objection made previously under 403, 5 your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Very well. Over that objection those 7 exhibits will be received. (Government's Exhibits 511B1, 511B2, 511B5, 511B6, 8 511B7, 511B1T, 511B2T, 511B5T, 511B6T and 511B7T received in 9 10 evidence) 11 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, when you're ready 12 we'll play 511B1. 13 This is a July 20 meeting between Emanuel Richardson, Jeff D'Angelo, and Munish Sood. 14 15 (Video played) Mr. Sood, where is this meeting taking place? 16 17 In Princeton, New Jersey. My office. 18 Q. And what specific player was Richardson discussing during 19 this part of the meeting?

A player named Naz Reid.

20

- 21 What was Richardson generally describing regarding Naz
- 22 Reid's recruitment process?
- 23 A. That he was recruiting. But LSU seemed to be more willing 24 to pay him to attend LSU. And then in return, since he had a relationship with the coach at LSU, he would be offering him a 25

(212) 805-0300

- job so this way that would ensure Naz Reid goes to LSU, not
 Arizona.
- 3 Q. Who offered who a job?
- 4 A. The head coach of LSU offered Emanuel Richardson a job.
- 5 Q. Now, Mr. Sood, at the time what was your understanding
- 6 based on this conversation and prior conversations regarding
- 7 | what financial -- what sorts of financial obligations assistant
- 8 coaches had?
- 9 A. Their obligation was that to from time to time or that the
- 10 | families or recruits -- recruits of families would require
- 11 | money and they would have to compete to make those payments to
- 12 get the kid to play at their university.
- 13 Q. Mr. Sood, based on the discussion that just occurred here,
- 14 were payments like that permissible under the rules?
- 15 | A. No.
- 16 | O. The NCAA rules?
- 17 | A. No.
- 18 \mathbb{Q} . If we could turn to 511B2.
- 19 (Video played)
- 20 | Q. Mr. Sood, during this portion of the meeting what players
- 21 were you specifically talking about?
- 22 A. Rawle Alkins.
- 23 | Q. And then later on was there a discussion regarding certain
- 24 | recruits?
- 25 A. Yes, Quinerly.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

25

Sood - Direct

- Q. Now, with respect to Quinerly, what, if anything, did
 Richardson tell you about Quinerly's mother?
- A. That she was looking to move to Tucson and also looking for a potential job.
 - Q. And looking at page 3, lines 1 to 5 when Richardson said,

 "This is what I can do for you to put you in a situation to

 move to Tucson. Once all of that stuff is in place, then she

 was like yeah. Then, you know, we'll do it publicly."

A. That he would be able to find her a job and then once -once they publicly announce that he's agreeing to play for
University of Arizona.

Did you understand what Richardson meant by this?

- Q. Mr. Sood, to be clear, your understanding at this time was the \$15,000 that was being requested was in connection with Book Richard recruiting Jahvon Quinerly, correct?
- A. Yes.
- 17 Q. So if we could go to 511B5.

(Video played)

- Q. Mr. Sood, I want to go back. At page 1, at lines 19 to 21 you said, "And I like what you said last time, coach, which is, you have to direct them. You can't give them options."
 - What were you referring to, Mr. Sood?
- A. That he would be just directing them to us, to Loyd
 Management.
 - Q. When you say "them," who do you mean?

J4T9DAW4

- 1 A. Meaning players.
- 2 Q. Mr. Sood, at this time what was your understanding
- 3 regarding the reason Mr. Richardson was going to be doing that?
- 4 A. Because we're giving him money to recruit.
- 5 Q. Now, going to page 2, Mr. Sood. Mr. Richardson
- 6 references -- this is at line 4, he says, "My analogy is always"
- 7 | the same. I'm -- you know, they don't know the difference if
- 8 you take them to a Benz dealer, BMW, and a Porche. They like
- 9 | them all."
- 10 What was your understanding of the analogy that
- 11 Mr. Richardson was providing here?
- 12 | A. That with his relationship he could direct the player.
- 13 | Q. Was he going to give the player options or just one option?
- 14 A. No. Just direct them to us. To Loyd.
- 15 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: If we could turn to 511B6,
- 16 Ms. Bustillo.
- 17 (Video played)
- 18 | Q. Mr. Sood, going back to page 1, when Mr. D'Angelo said,
- 19 | "We, we're gonna do -- gonna do 15 for three months, right?
- 20 And that should help with the kids." What did you understand
- 21 | him to mean?
- 22 | A. That we were giving him fifteen thousand dollars for the
- 23 particular recruit.
- 24 | Q. What did you observe happen during the meeting?
- 25 A. Jeff D'Angelo giving him an envelope of money.

- 1 Q. Going a little further down -- actually focusing on that,
- 2 | Mr. Sood, Mr. D'Angelo said, "We're going to do fifteen for
- 3 | three months." Did you understand what he meant by "fifteen
- 4 | for three months"?
- 5 A. That it would be five thousand a month.
- 6 Q. Sorry, Mr. Sood. You just said he gave him fifteen
- 7 | thousand. What does the three months mean?
- 8 A. That Emanuel Richardson will give the money over three
- 9 months to the mother.
- 10 | Q. Mr. Sood, who initially proposed providing this money to
- 11 | Emanuel Richardson?
- 12 A. Christian.
- 13 | Q. And when Richardson at page 1, line 15, "Just so you know I
- 14 | put ten in of my own to give to the kid's mom," what did you
- 15 | understand that to mean?
- 16 A. That he was using ten thousand of his personal money.
- 17 | Q. For what?
- 18 A. To pay the player's mom.
- 19 | Q. Then finally, Mr. Sood, you said at page 2, lines 7 to 8,
- 20 | "If we get these three kids I mean we're on the road." What
- 21 | did you mean by this?
- 22 | A. That we'd be off to a great start with Emanuel Richardson
- 23 | if he can refer us three clients.
- Q. When you say "three kids," what did you mean?
- 25 A. Three recruits either that are heading there or that are

J4T9DAW4 Sood - Direct

1 | already on the team.

2 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: If we could go to 511B7.

(Video played)

- 4 Q. Mr. Sood if you could take a look at page 2 and starting at
- 5 | line 25 through the top of page 3, Richardson said, "The goal
- 6 | is to -- when, 'Hey this kid's going to the NBA. Is he set,
- 7 | Book? 'Yup, he's straight. Book, can I come in and talk to
- 8 | him? No. It's done. Book, it's F'ing October. Damn, Book."
 - What did you understand Mr. Richardson to be referring
- 10 | to here?

3

9

- 11 A. That he would keep other agents and advisers away from the
- 12 particular player.
- 13 | Q. Mr. Sood, after this meeting with Mr. Richardson, did you
- 14 have any discussions with Christian Dawkins about what had
- 15 | happened at the meeting?
- 16 | A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. And generally what did you tell him?
- 18 A. That we gave Emanuel Richardson \$15,000.
- 19 | Q. Now, Mr. Sood, around this time in late July 2017 did you
- 20 | learn that Jeff D'Angelo and Christian Dawkins were planning to
- 21 | meet with other men's basketball coaches?
- 22 A. Yes.

25

- 23 | Q. And where was that going to occur?
- 24 A. Las Vegas.
 - Q. Were you planning to attend those meetings with D'Angelo

J4T9DAW4 Sood - Direct

1 and Dawkins in Las Vegas?

A. No.

2

5

6

- Q. Did you know who, if anyone, had been involved in setting
- 4 up the meetings in Las Vegas?
 - A. I believe --
 - MR. MOORE: Objection.
- 7 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 8 THE WITNESS: I believe both Christian and Merl Code.
- 9 Q. How did you learn Merl Code had been involved?
- 10 A. Christian mentioned it.
- 11 Q. Mr. Sood, did you participate in a phonecall with Merl Code
- 12 | and D'Angelo in advance of those meetings in Las Vegas?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. And Mr. Sood, at that time what was your understanding
- 15 regarding the reasons that Mr. Code was going to set up these
- 16 meetings for the group?
- 17 MR. MOORE: Objection.
- 18 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 19 | THE WITNESS: The goal was to -- for the team to meet
- 20 | with other coaches that would be interested in working with
- 21 Loyd Management.
- 22 | Q. Let me just rephrase the question, Mr. Sood. What was your
- 23 understanding regarding whether Mr. -- why Mr. Code was setting
- 24 up the meetings for you?
- MR. MOORE: Objection, your Honor. Asked and

25

Sood - Direct

1 answered. 2 THE COURT: Sustained. Q. Mr. Sood, I believe you previously testified that Mr. Code 3 4 was receiving a monthly retainer; is that correct? 5 A. Yes. 6 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: At this time, your Honor, the 7 government would offer Government Exhibit 301 and 301T. THE COURT: Any objection? 8 9 MR. MOORE: No objection. 10 MR. HANEY: No objection, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Those exhibits will be received. 12 (Government's Exhibits 301 and 301T received in 13 evidence) 14 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: We have hard copies to pass out to the jury, with your Honor's permission. 15 THE COURT: Very well. 16 17 This is a July 10, 2017 call between Munish Sood, Merl Code 18 and Jeff D'Angelo. 19 (Audio played) 20 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: If you could go to the next clip, 21 Ms. Bustillo. 22 (Audio played) 23 Q. Mr. Sood, at page 12, line 16 Mr. Code referenced

Q. Mr. Sood, at page 12, line 16 Mr. Code referenced prioritizing a list of guys. And you should have some, you know, some interaction with -- while you're out there. Do you

J4T9DAW4 Sood - Direct

1 | understand what he's referring to?

MR. MOORE: Your Honor. Same objection as previously made.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Coaches.

- O. Coaches for what?
- A. Who may be seeking money for recruiting.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Can I have one moment, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

(Counsel confer)

- 12 Q. Mr. Sood, I think you mentioned you didn't actually go to the meetings in Las Vegas, right?
- 13 A. Yes. I did not attend.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: You can take this down,
- 15 Ms. Bustillo.
- 16 Q. To your knowledge, did Mr. Code, in fact, set up the
- 17 | meetings in Las Vegas with some of these coaches?
- 18 A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- 19 Q. And what, if anything, did Christian Dawkins tell you about
- 20 | the meetings?
- 21 A. That they were plenty -- there were a number of meetings
- 22 and a number of the coaches left with money.
- 23 | Q. And do you recall him mentioning any specific coaches?
- 24 A. Tony Bland.
- 25 Q. Where did he coach again?

4T9DAW4	Sood -	Direct

- USC. 1 Α.
- 2 What was your understanding, if any, regarding whether Merl
- 3 Code had been paid by your company for setting up these
- 4 meetings?
- 5 MR. MOORE: Objection.
- 6 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 7 THE WITNESS: That he was being paid his monthly
- 8 retainer.
- 9 Q. Mr. Sood, soon after this call you had with Merl Code and
- 10 Jeff D'Angelo what, if anything, did you learn about certain
- 11 concerns Mr. Code had about Mr. D'Angelo?
- There was a call where -- between Merl Code and Jeff 12
- 13 D'Angelo where there was someone in the background with Jeff
- 14 D'Angelo. So Merl Code was concerned about who was with Jeff
- 15 D'Angelo on a particular call.
- 16 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, at this time the
- 17 government would offer Government Exhibit 119 and 119T.
- 18 THE COURT: Any objection?
- 19 MR. HANEY: No objection, your Honor.
- 20 No objection. MR. MOORE:
- THE COURT: 119 and 119T will be received. 21
- 22 (Government's Exhibits 119 and 119T received in
- 23 evidence)
- 24 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: This is a July 14, 2017 call
- 25 between Christian Dawkins and Munish Sood.

(At sidebar)

MR. MOORE: Your Honor, we're not re-litigating again the Gatto case and I believe this call's primarily about Brian Bowen. So I'm not so sure I see the relevance of it.

Mr. Chaney wanted to add something.

Sood - Direct

MR. CHANEY: I think on 403 grounds bringing up a statement in a conversation between Mr. D'Angelo and Mr. Code that relates only to the Bowen situation and not to any of the charged conduct in this case does not survive a 403 prejudice-versus-probative-value analysis.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, just to give you a little context. In the three-way call between Mr. Sood and Mr. D'Angelo and Mr. Code that we just listened to a portion of, there was a portion where Mr. D'Angelo appeared to potentially be speaking to another person on the phone. It's true. Part of that call related to paying this player named Brian Bowen who was the subject of the Gatto trial.

Mr. Code later expressed concerns about the fact that Mr. D'Angelo was on the phone, was talking to somebody else while he was on that phonecall, concerns he was being a little too open about all the things they were doing. Those concerns applied to the entirety of the phonecall, including the part that we offered. And it really just goes generally to consciousness of guilt of evidence that Mr. Code knows generally the types of things they're doing, whether it be

J4T9DAW4 Sood - Direct

making payments to players and families or paying coaches, he's not allowed to be doing it, and he's reaching out to say Jeff D'Angelo needs to be more careful.

MR. MOORE: He knows that you're not allowed to pay players because he knows it's a violation of the NCAA rules. In addition, Mr. Solowiejczyk didn't play that portion of the call for this jury. And so I think, given his failure to play that portion of the call, it should be 403ed out.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: That was pursuant to an agreement with the defense because they didn't want to get into this.

THE COURT: I'm going to allow it.

(Continued on next page)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

(In open court)

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, we offer 119 and 119T.

THE COURT: It will be received.

(Government's Exhibits 119 and 119T received in evidence)

(Audio played)

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: We can pause there, Ms. Bustillo.

- Q. So, Mr. Sood, going back to page 5, at line 19 you said, "I spoke to Jeff about, because Merl called me and I talked to
- 10 Jeff." Was it true that Merl Code had called you?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. And why had Mr. Code called you?
- 13 A. Regarding the conversation he had with -- when Jeff
- 14 D'Angelo had someone else with him on the call or behind him.
- 15 \parallel Q. And then at line 8 to 12 on page 6, Mr. Dawkins said, "I
- 16 mean definitely even if you're going to call him, you don't
- 17 | have to meet him in person or everything, but don't call him
- 18 and like be in the background talking to somebody else." What
- 19 | did you understand Mr. Dawkins to be saying there?
- 20 | A. That if you're -- we're trying to keep this thing quiet and
- 21 confidential. So he was concerned who else is Jeff sharing
- 22 | this information with.
- 23 | Q. Now, in addition, starting at the bottom of page 6,
- 24 | starting at line 17, there was a discussion of somebody
- 25 | named -- there was a discussion of a player. Which player was

J4T9DAW4 Sood - Direct

1 | that?

2

- A. Jeffrey Carroll.
- 3 | Q. And who coached Jeffrey Carroll at that time?
- 4 A. Lamont Evans.
- 5 Q. When Mr. the Dawkins said to you, this is at line 22,
- 6 Regardless of whatever the F he feels, if we're paying this
- 7 F'ing guy and we don't get Jeffrey Carroll, like what the F are
- 8 | we doing this for."
- 9 What did you understand him to be saying?
- 10 | A. If Lamont doesn't deliver Jeffrey Carroll, then we
- 11 | shouldn't be paying Lamont Evans going forward.
- 12 | Q. Now, Mr. Sood --
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: You can take that down,
- 14 Ms. Bustillo -- I'm sorry. Actually there's one more clip to
- 15 | play. My apologies. At page 16. Sorry.
- 16 (Video played)
- 17 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: You can take that down,
- 18 Ms. Bustillo.
- 19 | Q. Mr. Sood, you were discussing Lamont Evans with Mr. Dawkins
- 20 | in that prior call; is that right?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. Now, during the summer of 2017 what information did you
- 23 | learn, if any, regarding Lamont Evans -- let me withdraw that
- 24 question.
- In the summer of 2017 what, if anything, did you learn

- 1 | about Lamont Evans?
- 2 A. That he was -- he hadn't delivered a player and that --
- 3 | Q. Did you learn anything about other sources that Mr. Evans
- 4 was accepting money from?
- 5 A. Yes. He -- I learned that he was accepting money from a
- 6 | few other people including a sports agent.
- 7 | Q. And what was the name of that sports agent?
- 8 A. Michael Cohen -- sorry. Seth Cohen.
- 9 Q. And did you know Seth Cohen at that time?
- 10 | A. I did.
- 11 | Q. How did you hear about the fact that Seth Cohen was paying
- 12 | Lamont Evans?
- 13 A. Merl Code had brought it to my attention.
- 14 | Q. Did you have a conversation with Seth Cohen about it as
- 15 || well?
- 16 A. I believe I did, yes.
- 17 | Q. Did there come a point when you spoke to Christian Dawkins
- 18 regarding your concerns with respect to Lamont Evans?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, at this time the
- 21 government offers Government Exhibit 128 and 128T.
- 22 THE COURT: Any objection?
- MR. HANEY: No objection, your Honor.
- MR. MOORE: No objection, your Honor.
- THE COURT: 128 and T will be received.

someone else.

Sood - Direct

(Government's Exhibits 128 and 128T received in 1 2 evidence) 3 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: With the Court's permission, request to hand out hard copies to the jury. 4 5 THE COURT: Very well. MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, we can play a portion 6 7 of this call when you're ready. (Audio played) 8 Q. OK, Mr. Sood. I just want to go back over a couple things 9 10 that were said in this call. At page 2, line 21 to 23 you 11 said, "But Lamont scares me because he's taking money -- I told 12 you -- taking money from Seth." 13 Who was the Seth you were referring to again? Again, Seth Cohen. He's an agent. 14 Α. 15 Q. Whether you said, "Lamont scares me," what did you mean by that Mr. Sood? 16 17 That he's taking multiple -- he's taking from different 18 parties and promising the same player. Q. What about the fact that Mr. Evans was taking money from 19 20 multiple parties concerned you? 21 The fact that is he pulling a fast one on us and then will Α. 22 it be -- will people find out what's really going on with him. 23 When you say "pulling a fast one," what do you mean? 0. 24 Like is he taking our money and then delivering the kid to

- J4T9DAW4 Sood - Direct 1 Mr. Sood, just on the topic of Seth Cohen, did you have 2 ongoing discussions with Seth Cohen around this time? 3 Α. Yes. What were those generally regarding? 4 Q. He wanted me to invest in his company. 5 Did there come a point when you exchanged agreements 6 0. 7 regarding that? 8 Yeah. We had draft agreements. Did you ever actually, to your knowledge, invest in 9 10 Mr. Cohen's company? 11 Α. No. 12 You said he was a sports agent; is that right? 13 Α. Yes. Now, Mr. Sood, did you have any discussions with anyone 14 15 else around this timeframe regarding your concerns about Lamont 16 Evans? 17 A. Both Merl Code and Christian Dawkins. 18 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: At this time, your Honor, the government would offer Government Exhibit 23 and 23T. 19 20 Any objection? THE COURT: 21 MR. HANEY: No objection, your Honor. 22 MR. MOORE: No objection, your Honor.
 - evidence)

THE COURT:

23

24

25

(Government's Exhibits 23 and 23T received in

23 and 23T will be received.

J4T9DAW4

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

Sood - Direct

- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, again, permission to pass out hard copies.
- THE COURT: Very well.
 - MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, we're going to start at page 6, line 2 of the transcript.
 - This is a September 11, 2017 call between Munish Sood and Merl Code.

(Audio played)

- Q. Mr. Sood, what was Mr. Code generally advising you during this call?
- A. Not to be paying Lamont Evans.
- 12 Q. What was your understanding regarding what Mr. Code had
- 13 | learned about Lamont Evans?
- 14 A. That he had received money from Seth Cohen as well.
- Q. And to your knowledge did Merl Code and Seth Cohen have an independent relationship from you?
- 17 A. I believe they did, yes.
- Q. At page 6, lines 16 to 17 when Mr. Code said, "You know what I'm saying or had been. And Christian had given him money for a kid."
- 21 Did you understand what Mr. Code was referring to?
- A. That Christian had given him money in the past for a particular player.
- Q. And then finally at lines 19 to 20 of page 6, when Mr. Code said to you, "So, at some point in time it becomes where you're

J4T9DAW4

- 1 | just using me versus it being a necessity for the business."
- 2 What did you understand Code to mean by the phrase,
- 3 "necessity for the business"?
- 4 A. That is he really using the money for recruiting or is he
- 5 using the money for other purposes.
- 6 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: You can take that down,
- 7 Ms. Bustillo.
- 8 | Q. Now, Mr. Sood, directing your attention to August of 2017.
- 9 | Did there come a point when you took a trip with Christian
- 10 | Dawkins?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. What was the purpose of that trip?
- 13 A. We went to meet potential recruits, clients, in Arizona and
- 14 then Las Angeles.
- 15 | Q. And did you meet with any coaches during those trips?
- 16 A. We met with Emanuel Richardson and Tony Bland.
- 17 | Q. Who else accompanied you for the trip?
- 18 A. Besides Christian, it was Jill Bailey.
- 19 | Q. And who was Jill Bailey again?
- 20 A. The undercover agent.
- 21 | Q. Who did you understand her to be at that time?
- 22 A. Jeff D'Angelo's business partner.
- 23 | Q. Let's take the trips one at a time. So where specifically
- 24 | in Arizona did you go?
- 25 A. Campus of University of Arizona.

- 1 Q. And then after that did you go to California?
- 2 A. Yeah. We flew to L.A., Los Angeles.
- 3 | Q. So with respect to the Arizona meetings, what was your
- 4 | understanding of why you were going to Arizona?
- 5 A. To meet with Rawle Alkins.
- 6 Q. Did you end up meeting with Rawle Alkins?
- 7 | A. No.
- 8 | Q. Who did you meet with?
- 9 A. We met with his cousin named Rodney.
- 10 | Q. Did you also meet with Emanuel Richardson during the trip?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. Where did you meet with Richardson?
- 13 A. At a hotel.
- 14 | Q. And were you aware that meeting was being recorded?
- 15 | A. No.
- 16 | Q. Have you reviewed a recording of that meeting before
- 17 | testifying here today?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, at this time the
- 20 government offers Government Exhibits 518A through 518D and
- $21 \mid 518F$ and then also 518AT through 518DT and 518FT.
- MR. HANEY: No objection.
- 23 MR. MOORE: Same 403 objection, your Honor.
- 24 THE COURT: Over that objection, those exhibits will
- 25 be received.

4

5

6

7

8

9

Sood - Direct

(Government's Exhibits 518A through 518D and 518F and 1 518AT through 518DT and 518FT received in evidence) 2

Q. So this is 518A that we're going to be going through.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Ms. Bustillo, when you're ready you can hit play.

(Video played)

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: If you can pause for one second.

- Who are we looking at right now, Mr. Sood?
- Α. (No response).
- 10 Sorry. That's blocked. Q.
- 11 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Actually can you play a little more
- 12 Ms. Bustillo.
- 13 (Video played)
- 14 Emanuel Richardson. Α.
- 15 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Keep going, Ms. Bustillo.
- 16 (Video played)
- 17 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Is it possible to skip ahead a
- 18 little bit to the portion where they're not talking to the
- 19 server anymore.
- 20 (Video played)
- 21 Q. Mr. Sood, what player were you discussing during this
- 22 portion of the meeting?
- 23 Α. Rawle Alkins.
- Was he currently a player on the Arizona team? 24 Ο.
- 25 Α. Yes.

J4T9DAW4

1	Q. What specifically were you discussing with respect to Rawle
2	Alkins?
3	A. Who would help him make a decision which firm to work with
4	like Loyd Management.
5	Q. Who were you talking about that might be involved in that
6	decision?
7	A. Both Emanuel Richardson and Rodney, his cousin.
8	Q. So looking at page 1, lines 16 to 20 or page 2, lines 16 to
9	20 when Mr. Dawkins said, "So now I'm a tell you Rawle will
10	have a big part of his decision. I think Rodney, Rodney will
11	have some influence as well. As long as we don't have to deal
12	with the mom, I think we'll be fine." What did you understand
13	Dawkins to be saying?
14	A. That if the mother was not involved Rodney can help, he'll
15	help Rawle make a final decision.
16	(Continued on next page)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

J4THDaw5 Sood - Direct

- 1 BY MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK:
- 2 Q. A decision regarding what?
- 3 A. To which firm to -- to which adviser and agent to work
- 4 with.
- 5 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: All right. Turn to 518B, please,
- 6 Ms. Bustillo, 518B, as in boy.
- 7 (Video played)
- 8 BY MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK:
- 9 Q. All right. Mr. Sood, at page 1, lines 11 to 15,
- 10 Mr. Dawkins said, "Yeah, he's F'ing clueless, clueless, but
- 11 | that's good for us because I showed him a breakdown of
- 12 | everything he can -- I think he'll do what you tell him to do."
- 13 Right after that Mr. Richardson responded, "He will."
- 14 What did you understand that exchange to mean?
- 15 A. That Emanuel Richardson can direct him towards the company.
- 16 | Q. And the "he," you're talking about?
- 17 A. Rawle Alkins.
- 18 | Q. What did Dawkins say, if anything, regarding the role that
- 19 Rodney would play in this decision?
- 20 A. That if we have his support, he would be helpful as well.
- 21 | Q. And "he" was Mr. Alkins' cousin?
- 22 A. Correct.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: If we can go to 518C, please.
- 24 (Video played)
- 25 | Q. Mr. Sood, just going back up to page 1, line 3, you

- referenced, "That's how we get the 7-footer." Who was the 7-footer?
- 3 A. We're referencing De'Andre Ayton.
- 4 | Q. And then you said a couple lines after that, Mr. Sood,
- 5 Just remember what you said when we first saw you. You no
- 6 | longer giving suggestions, you're telling them." Do you
- 7 | remember that? What were you referring to, Mr. Sood?
- 8 A. The previous conversations with Emanuel Richardson where he
- 9 | had suggested that going forward working with us, he would just
- 10 be recommending us, no one else.
- 11 Q. Mr. Sood, at this time what, if anything, were you seeking
- 12 | from Richardson with respect to De'Andre Ayton?
- 13 A. An introduction.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: If we can go to 518D, Ms. Bustillo.
- 15 | (Video played)
- 16 | Q. Mr. Sood, what player was generally being discussed during
- 17 | this portion of the meeting?
- 18 A. De'Andre Ayton.
- 19 | Q. What, if anything, was Richardson telling you about Ayton?
- 20 A. He's one of the best players he's ever seen.
- 21 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: If we could go to 518F.
- 22 (Video played)
- 23 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Pause here, Ms. Bustillo.
- 24 | Q. All right. Mr. Sood, just going back to the very beginning
- of that clip, when Ms. Bailey said, "Thank you for hooking

J4THDaw5

3

- things up, " and then Richardson said, "I did my job, " what did you understand that exchange to be about?
 - A. Setting up a meeting with Rawle's cousin Rodney.
- Q. Who do you believe was responsible for helping set up that meeting?
- 6 A. Emanuel Richardson.
- 7 | Q. At page 2, looking at lines 3 through 5, when
- 8 Mr. Richardson said, "I'm just telling you, that's what will be
- 9 powerful, and we all sit down and just like, OK, Book, this is
- 10 | who I trust," what did you understand Mr. Richardson to be
- 11 | referring to?
- 12 A. That he would have influence over Rawle to help make a
- 13 decision to work with us.
- 14 | Q. After this meeting with Emanuel Richardson, did you, in
- 15 | fact, meet with Rawle Alkins' cousin Rodney?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. Prior to testifying today, have you reviewed a recording of
- 18 | that meeting?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. All right. Mr. Sood, I'm just going to ask you some
- 21 | questions so you can give us a general summary of what
- 22 happened.
- 23 During the meeting, what did Rodney generally discuss
- 24 | with you regarding his role in Rawle Alkins' life?
- 25 | A. That -- that Rawle Alkins' mom had -- had him travel and

5

6

7

9

- move down -- move to University of Arizona to stay with him and manage him, and then he would work with Rawle once he turns pro as well, and he will be part of his decision-making.
 - Q. Are you familiar with a term that's often used to describe somebody like Rodney?
 - A. It's called a handler.
 - Q. Where'd you meet with Rodney, by the way?
- 8 A. Same hotel, right after the Emanuel Richardson meeting.
 - Q. Who else was there besides you and Rodney?
- 10 A. Jill Bailey and Christian Dawkins was there.
- 11 | Q. What was the purpose of that meeting?
- 12 A. Again, to introduce ourselves, tell him what we do, and
- 13 | then talk to him about him working with us.
- 14 | Q. Based on the discussions you had that day with Richardson
- 15 | and Dawkins, what, if anything, was your understanding
- 16 regarding what Rodney's role was going to be?
- 17 A. Rodney's role would be help influence Rawle to work with
- 18 us.
- 19 Q. Now, Mr. Sood, based on the discussion that you had with
- 20 | Dawkins, Bailey, and Rodney, did you have a sense of whether
- 21 Dawkins and Rodney had met before?
- 22 | A. I believe they'd met the day -- the night before.
- 23 \ Q. Do you know who originally introduced them?
- 24 | A. Emanuel Richardson.
- 25 | Q. Based on the meeting, the discussion that happened, what

J4THDaw5

- was your understanding regarding whether Rodney intended to recommend that Rawle work with you?
- 3 A. He seemed on board to recommend us.
- 4 | Q. Did you get to meet with Rawle Alkins during that trip?
- 5 | A. No.
- 6 Q. Do you know if Dawkins met with Alkins?
- 7 A. I believe he met him the night before.
- 8 | Q. How do you know that?
- 9 A. He mentioned it.
- 10 Q. What did Rodney say, if anything, regarding whether you
- 11 | could meet with Alkins in the future?
- 12 A. He said he would arrange a meeting next time we're back in
- 13 Arizona.
- 14 | Q. During your discussion with Rodney, did Emanuel
- 15 | Richardson's name come up at all?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. What did Rodney tell you Richardson had said to him, if
- 18 anything?
- 19 | A. That they were good people, and he would direct Rawle to
- 20 meet with us and potentially work with us.
- 21 | Q. During the meeting, did Rodney tell you anything about any
- 22 concerns that Rawle Alkins had about this?
- 23 | A. Rawle would ask what would -- what would this be -- what
- 24 | would it be -- what would it be for -- what would Emanuel
- 25 Richardson get from this.

- 1 | Q. Who did he say that to?
- 2 A. To the group.
- 3 Q. Let me take a step back, Mr. Sood. You had a conversation
- 4 | with Rodney, right?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- Q. Did Rodney convey anything to you about what Alkins had
- 7 | said to him?
- 8 A. Yes. What is -- what is in this for --
- 9 MR. HANEY: Objection. Object to hearsay.
- 10 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 11 A. What is in this for Emanuel Richardson?
- 12 | Q. And at the end of the meeting, what did Rodney indicate
- 13 regarding whether he was going to recommend you?
- 14 A. He would.
- 15 Q. Now, Mr. Sood, after this meeting in Arizona, where'd you
- 16 go from there?
- 17 A. To Los Angeles.
- 18 Q. How did you get there?
- 19 A. We flew.
- 20 | Q. Why were you going to Los Angeles that day, Mr. Sood?
- 21 A. To meet with Tony Bland.
- 22 | Q. Your trip to Los Angeles, besides meeting with Tony Bland,
- 23 were you going there to meet with anyone else?
- 24 A. Yes. Tony Bland had set up meetings with a father of the
- 25 | high school player who will be attending USC and a family

J4THDaw5 Sood - Direct

- 1 member of another player.
- 2 | Q. Had you met Tony Bland before this trip?
- 3 | A. No.
- 4 | Q. When you first got to LA, who did you meet with?
- 5 A. We met with the -- a father of a high school player who was
- 6 headed to USC by the name of Taeshon Cherry.
- 7 | Q. That was the name of the player?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And you met with his father?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. Who was present for that meeting?
- 12 A. Myself, Jill Bailey, and Christian and the father.
- 13 | Q. What was your understanding about who, if anyone, had set
- 14 | up the meeting with Cherry's father?
- 15 A. Tony Bland set up the meeting.
- 16 Q. Generally, what was discussed during your meeting with
- 17 | Cherry's father?
- 18 A. Just the services we provided, how we could help them, and
- 19 | in return, how Tony Bland spoke highly of us.
- 20 | Q. What, if anything, happened at the end of the meeting?
- 21 A. Jill Bailey gave Christian Dawkins \$4,000 to give to the
- 22 | father.
- 23 | Q. Did you personally see Dawkins give the money to the
- 24 father?
- 25 A. No.

- Q. Now, during this trip, did there come a point when you met with Tony Bland himself?
- 3 | A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Do you recall where that occurred?
- 5 | A. I was at a restaurant on campus of USC.
- Q. Prior to the meeting, what, if anything, had Dawkins told you about Bland?
- A. That Tony Bland was assistant coach at USC, a couple of good recruits coming, and well-connected on the West Coast.
- 10 Q. Mr. Sood, I believe you previously testified you were aware
- 11 Mr. Bland had met with Dawkins and D'Angelo in Las Vegas?
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. What was your understanding of what happened at that meeting?
- 15 A. That Jeff D'Angelo gave Tony Bland money.
- Q. What was your understanding of the purpose of the meeting with Bland that day?
- 18 A. To introduce us to some of his players.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, at this point the government would offer Government Exhibit 521A through 521D, and the associated transcripts, 521AT through 521DT.
- 22 THE COURT: Any objection?
- MR. HANEY: No objection.
- MR. MOORE: No objection.
- 25 | THE COURT: 521A through D and the transcripts will be

J4THDaw5 Sood - Direct

1 received.

(Government's Exhibits 521A through 521D and 521AT through 521DT received in evidence)

BY MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK:

Q. So this is an August 31, 2017, meeting between Munish Sood, Jill Bailey, Tony Bland, and Christian Dawkins.

Mr. Sood, before -- and you can publish it to the jury, Ms. Bustillo.

Before we start, who were we looking at on the screen?

A. Tony Bland.

MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: All right. You can begin playing,
Ms. Bustillo.

(Video played)

- Q. All right. Mr. Sood, going back to the beginning of that recording, you mentioned at page 1, line 7 and 9, you mentioned meeting Taeshon's dad. Who was that again?
- A. A high school player who had committed to USC.
 - Q. So then Dawkins talks about at page 2, lines 9 -- starting around line 9, he says, "So one of the things that me and Tony were discussing, I think it's important (unintelligible) this situation (unintelligible) value out here. So I guess one of the reasons why -- because all of the resources, whatever the case may be, it's as clean as possible," then he went on to say, "It's as clean as possible to go directly who them."

What did you understand Mr. Dawkins to be saying?

Sood - Direct

- A. It's cleaner, more straightforward just going to the parents instead of going to Tony Bland.
- 3 | Q. Was Tony Bland present at that conversation?
- 4 | A. Yes.

8

- 5 | Q. If you gave money to a family member in the manner that
- 6 Dawkins described, what was your understanding how, if at all,
- 7 | that would be helpful to Tony Bland?
 - A. It would help Tony recruit the player.
- 9 Q. What if it was a player already on the USC team?
- 10 A. He can help them direct that player to us.
- 11 Q. When Dawkins said, "It's as clean as possible," did you
- 12 understand what he meant by the word "clean"?
- 13 A. That if the money's cash, it's not going to be able to be
- 14 | tied back to anyone.
- 15 \parallel Q. But paying directly to the family versus playing through
- 16 | Bland, what's clean about that?
- 17 A. That the coach can't get in trouble.
- 18 | Q. Taking a look at page 2, lines -- starting around line 25
- 19 | and then to the top of page 3, Bland said, "My part of the job
- 20 can be to get parents and to introduce them to Christian, say,
- 21 | hey, I trust him. This is -- can vouch for him and even you
- 22 | guys." What did you understand Bland to be offering to do
- 23 here?
- 24 A. Introduce us and -- to the players' parents.
- 25 | Q. When you said "vouch for him," what did you understand that

Sood - Direct

- 1 | to mean?
- 2 A. That Tony trusts Christian.
- 3 | Q. When Bland said at page 3, line 5, "And some guys like
- 4 Cherry, I can say, this is what you're doing, "what did you
- 5 understand that to mean?
- 6 A. That he could direct -- in this case, he can direct Cherry
- 7 | to work with Christian and us.
- 8 | Q. At page 5, Mr. Sood, looking at line -- around line 18,
- 9 | Bland said, "We have a couple opportunities where you've got us
- 10 | a gold mine over here. So we've had this opportunity before,
- 11 | but it's not been this clean. And from a guy that I'm
- 12 | really -- that I trust."
- I just want to take that statement a piece at a time.
- 14 When Bland said, "We have a couple of opportunities where
- 15 | you've got us a gold mine over here," did you understand what
- 16 he meant by gold mine?
- 17 | A. Potential players.
- 18 | Q. When Bland said, "We've had this opportunity before, but
- 19 | it's not been this clean, " what did you understand that to
- 20 | mean?
- 21 A. Access to money.
- 22 | Q. Bland mentioned having trust. What did you understand him
- 23 | to mean when he talked about trust?
- 24 A. That he trusts Christian.
- MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Your Honor, this might be a good

J4THDaw5 Sood - Direct point to break. THE COURT: Yes, it's almost 2:30. So, ladies and gentlemen, we'll break for the day. Please have a pleasant evening. Please do not read anything or watch anything you may see in the media about the case. Please do not discuss the case. We'll get started promptly tomorrow at 9:30. Have a pleasant night. (Jury excused) (Continued on next page)

25

1 (Jury not present) 2 THE COURT: Mr. Sood, you may step down. 3 Everyone be seated. 4 About how much more do you think, Mr. Solowiejczyk? 5 MR. SOLOWIEJCZYK: Not much at all, your Honor. 6 Probably about ten minutes at most. 7 THE COURT: Any other issues that the parties wish to raise? 8 9 MR. MARK: Last night there was a motion that was 10 filed by defendant Code's counsel related to two witnesses that he intends to call and a request for a ruling on admissibility 11 of certain evidence. We will file a written response to that. 12 13 I mean, largely, it looks like most of that testimony that he 14 seeks to admit is plainly hearsay testimony that would be inadmissible, but we'll write specifically on that. 15 In connection with that motion, though, we asked and 16 17 made a request for 3500 material of the defense for their notes of conversations with those witnesses, largely because it's 18 incredibly important to flesh out what these people are going 19 20 to testify about, which is not that clear in the motion that 21 was made by defendant Code. And in responding to that request 22 that we made of Code's counsel, they basically, it seemed to 23 be, implicitly acknowledging that they had rough notes of those 24 conversations, but they thought that they didn't have anything

that was 3500 material. As your Honor knows, in this district

Sood - Direct

we don't play too cute with the rules of what 3500 material requires. We produce our notes, we produce memorandums of our notes, and that's the practice that we follow.

In response to that request, defendant Code's counsel said that they thought they didn't need to produce those, and we cited to him a case from the Second Circuit, U.S. v. Scotti, that particularly outlines the procedure when it is doubtful or there is a question of whether notes are producible. And that Second Circuit case, it's 47 F.3d 1237, Second Circuit case from 1995, specifically says that when the notes are subject to discovery and there's a question of whether they're discoverable, a proper procedure is for those notes to be submitted to the trial court for an in camera review to determine whether they are discoverable. And it also states that the Court may, in its discretion, consider extrinsic evidence in deciding whether the notes qualify as a witness statement under 3500.

So as we let defendant Code's counsel know, we are specifically requesting your Honor to do an *in camera* review of those notes to determine whether they are producible under the Jencks Act.

THE COURT: Mr. Moore.

MR. MOORE: Yes, your Honor, I find it somewhat interesting that the government takes a position that these documents are producible under the Jencks Act because if you

Sood - Direct

read the Jencks Act, 18 U.S.C. Section 3500, it only deals with the production of materials by the government. It does not address the production of any materials by any defense attorney for any purpose whatsoever. It is completely silent as to that.

I asked the government if they had any case law on point that dealt with the production by defense counsel of material to the government. They cited me no such case. The Scotti case that they cited deals with a procedure for the government to produce information in camera to a district judge for the purpose of determining if it is 3500 material. There is no 3500 material that applies to defense counsel. 3500 simply does not apply.

However, just for the purpose of completeness,
Rule 26.2 addresses the production of witness statements, both
by the government and the defense. And Rule 26.2's definition
of a statement is a little different than the Jencks Act
definition of a statement. It defines a statement as a written
statement that the witness makes, signs, or otherwise adopts or
approves — we do not have that here, I will tell you that as
an officer of the court — a substantially verbatim,
contemporaneously recorded recital of the witness' oral
statements that is contained in any recording or any
transcription of any recording. The plain language of that
Rule says if you record a witness, actually record their

Sood - Direct

statement by means electronically, then you must produce the recording or a stenographic transcription of that recording or the witness' statement to a grand jury, however taken or recorded, or transcription of such a statement. That, obviously, does not apply here.

I don't think --

THE COURT: Does it have to be recorded? Can it be written? What if you wrote -- had really good note-taking skills and had substantially verbatim accounts of what those witnesses told you?

MR. MOORE: I don't, but if I were a government attorney, then that clearly would apply for 26.2 -- excuse me, that would apply for the Jencks Act, 18 U.S.C. 3500, which does not apply to us as defense counsel.

According to the rule, the rule says -- first of all, we don't have a written statement made by the witness. Second, we don't have a substantially verbatim contemporaneously recorded statement. The rule requires that you have a recorded statement, recorded by means of audio or video recording, and then create a transcript. At least that appears to me to be the plain language of the rule.

That's why I asked the government for any case law in support of their rather novel position that the Jencks Act applies to defendants. They provided me with no such case law. I asked them if they had any case law that related to

Rule 26.2. They have provided us with no case law.

I will tell you, as an officer of the court, that I didn't take notes of a brief discussion that we had on the phone with Mr. Mowery the other day, and I have not talked to Ms. Tutwiler. I believe that Mr. Mathias has spoken to Ms. Tutwiler, I do not believe he took any notes. Mr. Chaney took very brief notes of a conversation that we had with Mr. Mowery on -- excuse me, with Warren Broughton on Sunday, and I don't believe that it's substantially verbatim. But if your Honor chooses or asks -- if your Honor wants us to produce them in camera, then we'll produce them to you in camera. Mr. Haley is no longer part of this team. I understand he may have had discussions with them. I don't believe he has any notes.

MR. MARK: Your Honor, I assume Mr. Moore is familiar with, since he's cited Rule 26.2, which is obviously on point, the reason we refer to the Jencks Act is the advisory committee notes specifically make reference that Rule 26.2 is designed to place disclosure of prior relevant statements of a defense witness in the possession of the defense on the same legal footing as in the disclosure of prior statements of prosecution witnesses in the hands of the government under the Jencks Act. That's from the advisory committee notes, Rule 26.2 in 1979, a long time ago.

So since there clearly are a number of sets of notes,

Sood - Direct

including by current and prior counsel, we so — including by Haley who is — counsel Haley, who is also counsel of record, we would think that all of those notes are at least potentially discoverable, and we just request that they be submitted for *in camera* review for the Court's determination of whether they are discoverable or not.

THE COURT: OK. I haven't read the committee notes, but I do know that it's customary for defense lawyers here to turn over 3500 materials when they call witnesses. But given that case law, Mr. Moore, do I need to look at this stuff, or would you agree that the notes that you have, strictly speaking, are in the nature of 3500 materials and just turn it over to the government?

MR. MOORE: First of all, I don't have Mr. Haley's notes. Mr. Haley is in South Carolina. He has not been a party to this case. And, apparently, Mr. Mark didn't listen to what I said. I said I do not know if he has notes or not. I can speak to you in camera about why he's no longer a part of the defense team if your Honor wishes me to do that. I don't want to do that in open court. I doubt very seriously that he has notes.

MR. MARK: Your Honor, he's still counsel of record for this case. So to the extent that he has notes, I'm sure he can email them over to your Honor and Mr. Moore.

THE COURT: I think, in an overabundance of caution, I

J4THDaw5 Sood - Direct

have not relieved Mr. Haley from this case, so as far as I'm concerned, he's still counsel of record. I believed that he would be counsel at this trial. If he has -- well, I would direct you, Mr. Moore, or one of your team, to contact Mr. Haley and produce to you what notes he may have of conversations with those two witnesses.

MR. MOORE: Could we approach for just one moment so I can speak at sidebar about this?

THE COURT: All lawyers or just --

MR. MOORE: Just the lawyers.

(Page 897 SEALED)

(At sidebar)

MR. MOORE: I can say this back on the record, I don't agree that what we have is 3500 material, but I'd probably prefer to turn them over to your Honor *in camera*. It will take you about two minutes to read it, if that.

THE COURT: If I can read it.

MR. CHANEY: About ten seconds.

MR. MOORE: Assuming you can read it. I think if you look at it, you'll understand why I don't think it's substantially verbatim.

THE COURT: OK.

(In open court)

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MR.\ MOORE:}}$ I would ask that that sidebar be sealed, your Honor.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. MARK: No objection.

THE COURT: OK. That sidebar will be sealed, subject to any motion by either party to move to unseal.

So, Mr. Mark.

MR. MARK: Just one thing. I think this is not something we can actually resolve right now, but I just want to tee it up for your Honor because it's been a continuous issue, which is the defense request for the testimony of certain FBI agents. As you know, they made a *Touhy* request. We told them we were going to file motions in limine geared towards most of

it. Your Honor issued an *in limine* ruling precluding the brunt of that, the requested testimony. We then asked, in light of that ruling, if there was any potentially admissible testimony that the defense wanted to obtain from any of these four FBI agents that they had subpoenaed, and that was last week.

We just received a response during the trial day today of what that material that they seek to elicit from those agents is. It seems to us to all be inadmissible, so we'll file a written response to your Honor. I'm highlighting that mainly because we would, obviously — if your Honor was considering another way, we'd have to make those witnesses available, but we don't think it's going to come to that, because we really don't think there's any admissible testimony that they have or that they're seeking from these agents.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. MOORE: I would simply say, your Honor, that, as I believe I said, I felt like I needed to preserve my position until I saw what evidence the government presented, particularly through Mr. Blazer. I believe he ended -- we came very close to ending the day Friday on him, and we have spent a lot of time dealing with other issues this weekend. But I think that it is interesting, since the government never responded to my February letter and never responded to my March letter, that now they complain that I'm dilatory, but we will address whatever they say.

THE COURT: I didn't understand Mr. Mark to be complaining that you were dilatory, but --

MR. MARK: No, I was just saying that this issue is now before us at this point in time, and I wanted to give you a heads-up.

And as to the responses, we have continually been engaged with and responded to them. To the extent he has an issue with FBI's procedure, that's an issue with the Administrative Procedure Act and one that he can take up if he thinks that that was not complied with.

THE COURT: Very well. Unless there's anything more that the parties want to raise now, we can take five minutes and reconnoiter.

MR. MOORE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Thank you.

(Recess)

THE COURT: Just wanted to touch base quickly on the proposed charges. Obviously, I'm going to have some boilerplate charges with respect to general requests in the indictment, what is evidence, so forth, and boilerplate charges with respect to duty to deliberate and what is evidence and how to — how to evaluate the evidence.

With respect to the substantive charges here, we have a lot of recent experience here in the Southern District not only with the Gatto case but with a number of New York State

public corruption cases, including Valerie -- Judge Caproni's case in Percoco and Judge Kimba Wood's case in Skelos. So it appears as though a lot of this ground has already been plowed. I note that the government's proposed charges hew pretty closely to that authority and to Judge Kaplan's instructions in the Gatto case.

A couple of questions that I had concern the bribery versus gratuity theory. I take it the government is going to be arguing both?

MR. MARK: That's correct, your Honor, and that's what's alleged in the indictment.

THE COURT: With respect to the Travel Act charge, the government's theory there is that they violated any one of a number of different state -- do we, strictly speaking, need to go down that road?

MR. MARK: I don't think we need to go down the road of parsing --

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ SOLOWIEJCZYK: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question.

THE COURT: There are a number, like a South Carolina statute, a California statute, I believe various state statutes.

MR. MARK: Your Honor, I mean, we laid it out there. We can probably talk with defense counsel a little bit on that issue. They're all basically substantially the same state

statute. Obviously, there needs to be reference to a state commercial bribery statute, but given that they're all basically the same, I'm not sure that we need to go down the road of boring the jury with each of the different state statutes. But maybe we can discuss that with defense counsel and see what their position is.

THE COURT: How many different states actually did you provide?

MR. MARK: There are four different state statutes.

THE COURT: I take it they relate to the schools that we have been actively talking about in this trial?

MR. MARK: That's correct. They relate to schools -so there were three coaches -- Lamont Evans, Emanuel "Book"
Richardson, and Tony Bland -- who taught, amongst them, at four different schools in four different states, so those are the particular state statutes that are cited in that count.

THE COURT: With respect to the -- I take it someone or another is going to want a missing witness charge?

MR. MOORE: Yes, sir.

MR. CHANEY: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: At this point I intend to use my standard charge which essentially says that mention has been made of various individuals that were not called, and I instruct you that all of those individuals were as available or not available to either side equally. Is there going to be a

government summary witness?

MR. MARK: There's a small potential for that, but it's more likely that the government will probably just present the materials just directly to the jury without a witness, but we'll probably determine that tomorrow, your Honor.

THE COURT: So there's no summary chart that you intend to provide?

MR. MARK: No, not at this moment, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are there any false exculpatory statements that either party is going to be pointing to? Because I have not heard any if that's the case, but I could be wrong.

MR. MARK: At this point in time, I don't believe so from the government.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. MOORE: Your Honor, just if we could go back to the missing witness argument for a moment?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. MOORE: We would object to that standard charge because I think the facts here are different. We've subpoenaed witnesses from the FBI. Those witnesses have not been made available to us for us to interview, to make a proffer to your Honor as to what their testimony would be, etc. In addition, we have no ability to -- we have no access to the three defendants who pled guilty.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, to the three?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. MOORE: The three defendants in this case, the three coaches who entered guilty pleas before your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MOORE: All three of them entered guilty pleas. The government has the ability, and as I pointed out last week, if you'll recall, the government asked -- your Honor had scheduled a sentencing for at least one of those individuals to take place prior to this trial. You had set a time and date for that. The government, through Mr. Boone, asked your Honor to defer sentencing until after this trial, and so your Honor did. The government could have let that sentencing go forward, immunize that witness, and made him -- and compelled him to testify in this case by taking away his Fifth Amendment rights. And I know that there's a lot of law on the fact that the defense has no such ability to do it, but that sole authority rests with the government, and I know that it rests with the government. I exercised it seven or eight times in my 23 years as a federal prosecutor. It's solely their right to do that. They could have done it. They chose not to.

I think that, given all of those facts, I don't think that the charge that these witnesses are equally available to each party holds any water here.

(Continued on next page)

24

25

THE COURT: Mr. Mark.

MR. MARK: Well, first on the FBI agents, as I commented earlier when we were talking about the *Touhy* issues, is that to the extent these witnesses have any admissible evidence, we have noted that we will make them available. So there is no issue of unavailability. It's the matter that they just have no relevant testimony. So that's not a basis for that request.

Second, as to a request based on the witnesses who have pled guilty to the exact same crimes of which the defendants are charged with and their supposed desire to have them testify despite, I don't think we're aware of any subpoenas being issued to them, that has no merit. I don't think they cite to a single case for which they say that because they think that we can compel a witness to testify that then that witness is equally available to both sides. Of course, as they know, the immunity order is one that's issued by the Court, not by the government, so it's actually the Court that grants immunity or not.

THE COURT: Yes. But I don't do that sua sponte. And I do it with a request from the government.

And by the way, Mr. Moore, you did it six or seven times. In 20 years I've not seen it done.

MR. MOORE: I did it six or seven times, in unusual circumstances perhaps. I did it very early on and in an odd

case where a cooperating witness decided he no longer wanted to cooperate right before trial. So, and that was the first -- my first go around with it.

As your Honor correctly notes, it is -- your Honor has no authority to compel -- to issue an immunity order absent a motion from the government. The government --

THE COURT: Or a motion from the defense. I mean I have seen that done as well. But the standard or the -- it's a very high hurdle.

MR. MOORE: The case law that I have seen on defense motions -- I've never seen one granted in any proceeding. Now I can't say that I've read each and every one of those cases but I've read a number of them. I've been unable to locate any authority where a district judge has granted a defense request to immunize a witness. It is some what routinely done, depending on the facts, in cases where the government chooses to immunize a witness.

I also noted, for purposes of the record, that the government allowed these witnesses to plead to one count, dismissed other counts without requiring their cooperation as a reward for that. I think that that is a factor that applies here.

THE COURT: That's consistent with the Department of Justice policy, as I understand it, and the policy of this office. So you're not required or that the office does not

require a defendant to plead to the entire indictment if they're not going to cooperate.

MR. MOORE: I understand, but the government retains the ability to do that. I have no bargaining power with those witnesses, if you will, your Honor. They are unavailable to me. Period.

With respect to Mr. Mark telling me that he would make these witnesses available to us, these FBI agents. I have asked him to make them available to me tomorrow for an interview so I can then make a proffer to your Honor as to exactly what evidence I would seek to elicit from them.

THE COURT: I'm not going to get in the middle of those negotiations. My role here is to determine, if the government asks me to do so, whether or not the proffered evidence would be relevant to any issue in this case.

MR. MOORE: I'm just trying to take Mr. Mark up on what I thought was his offer to make them available. He says I'll make them available to you. I'd like him to make them available to me and we'll see where we go.

MR. MARK: As he full well knew, I said make him available to testify which is what we were talking about.

THE COURT: Let me ask the government this. How far away are we from you resting?

MR. MARK: We understand there's probably about -- obviously, please correct me if I'm wrong, but from talking

with defense counsel, maybe about three-and-a-half hours of cross of Mr. Sood. There's only a little bit of Mr. Sood's testimony that's left on direct. After that the next witness would be a representative, a senior representative from the University of Southern California. He is in from out of town. He's been here today. He will be here tomorrow. We're hopeful that we can get him off the stand tomorrow so he can go back to L.A. He'll obviously be here to testify if we need to on Wednesday. After that, there is a handful of recordings, text messages, and e-mails that we'll introduce. As we said, we might do it through a summary witness but we might just forego that and just present it directly to the Court. So we do anticipate that we'll be able to rest on Wednesday.

THE COURT: OK. Go ahead.

MR. MARK: And just one thing. I'm just going to lay a marker down. There was one thing on the jury instructions that I wanted to return to but since I didn't raise it before I don't want to interrupt your Honor's --

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. MARK: Which is just that I know you referenced in connection with the bribery charges, and which is charged sort of a couple of substantive ways through the honest services theory of wire fraud as well as through 666, and your Honor referenced some of the cases that this office has brought in connection with public officials and those public corruption.

You'll note probably in our request to charge we specifically modeled them off the private honor services fraud cases, that there have also been plenty within this district which have a little bit of difference in them because <code>McDonald</code> is a public sector honor services case. So we just wanted to note that. I know your Honor was I'm sure quite familiar with that but given your Honor's reference to the <code>Skelos</code> and <code>Silver</code> case that was the one point, and I think that <code>McDonald</code> to the extent that there is any reference from defense about that, the Second Circuit has held doesn't play to the 666 count. So that's not necessary in that charge.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. MOORE: Your Honor, I can also tell you I also anticipate a Rule 29 motion on obviously all counts but a hopefully fairly strong one on the Travel Act count and we can certainly talk to the government, in case your Honor denies that motion, on a charge. I will tell you that we -- because I'm sure that one of the things your Honor wants to know is are you -- are we going to have a defense. And obviously from the motion that was filed last night that we -- defendant Code intends to call two witnesses for sure. We intend to seek to offer certain calls. I cannot tell you that my client has made any decision yet as to whether he will or will not testify. But I think that it is likely if the government rests on Wednesday that we might get this case to the jury this week

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

assuming -- but I'm not so sure, that we will get this case to the jury this week if we have the same schedule on Wednesday and Thursday and so I'm just asking your Honor to consider whether we might run a little longer on Wednesday and Thursday with the goal to actually getting it to them on Thursday and letting them begin their deliberations. That is obviously up to the Court. I know that your Honor said that at some point you would talk with the jury and ascertain their preferences. I can tell you I would certainly like to get this case to them this week if that is at all possible.

THE COURT: Absolutely. My agreement with the jury is always if you get here on time I will get you out on time and that seems to work. I'm happy to suggest to them that we might get them back to their lives sooner than later if we adjust our workday a little bit. So, for example, I mean I'd like very much -- we'll talk about the length of the summations, but if we can get the summations all in over the course of one day that would be useful. I mean my guess is that the jury charge will probably be an hour-and-a-half or so or hopefully something short of two hours. That eats up a lot of time. Ι think we'll get them the case this week. I don't know that we'll have a verdict this week. I know that one of the jurors has a Wednesday of next week trip planned. So I'm sort of using that as -- working backwards from there see how much I can push.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I want to work as efficiently and as quickly as we And if I have to go back to the jury and fall on the sword and make them work a little longer, I'm happy to do that if I think we can get stuff done. OK. MR. MOORE: I will tell you that we will get your Honor a briefing tonight on the catch-all exception of the hearsay rule issue. I understand the government wants to submit a paper. We'll submit our own. And then I understand that the government is going to respond to our motion concerning the two witnesses. I'm assuming they can go ahead and respond without reading this potential 3500 material. We'll get that information to your Honor as soon as possible. THE COURT: OK. MR. MOORE: In camera. THE COURT: Very well. MR. MOORE: And I assume that to do that I would simply e-mail like make a copy and e-mail it to the Court and chambers. THE COURT: Yes. MR. CHANEY: We could do that.

THE COURT: Or just hand up a hard copy. I'll be here.

MR. CHANEY: We don't have a hard copy with us, Judge.

THE COURT: OK. Whatever is easiest for you guys.

MR. MOORE: Yes, sir. Thank you.

```
J4T9DAW6
               THE COURT: OK. Have a good night.
1
               MR. HANEY: Thank you, your Honor, you too.
2
3
               THE COURT: I look forward to the e-mails.
               (Adjourned to April 30, 2019 at 9 a.m.)
 4
5
6
 7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	INDEX OF EXAMINATION	
2	Examination of: Page	
3	MUNISH SOOD	
4	Direct By Mr. Solowiejczyk 766	
5	GOVERNMENT EXHIBITS	
6	Exhibit No. Received	
7	106 and 106T	
8	509B1, B2, B3, B4, 509B1T, B2T, B3T and 819	
9	B4T	
10	511B1, 511B2, 511B5, 511B6, 511B7, 855	
11	511B1T, 511B2T, 511B5T, 511B6T	
12	and 511B7T	
13	301 and 301T	
14	119 and 119T	
15	119 and 119T	
16	128 and 128T	
17	23 and 23T 872	
18	518A through 518D and 518F and 518AT 876	
19	through 518DT and 518FT	
20	104 and 104T 841	
21	106 and 106T	
22	142 and 142T 838	
23	144 and 144T844	
24	203 and 203T 789	
25	506B through 506F and 506BT through 506FT . 780	

1	
1	507 and 507T
2	521A through 521D and 521AT through 521DT . 886
3	623
4	655
5	658
6	659
7	1632B
8	1632A
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
ļ	